

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, September 9, 1993

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. HUTTO].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 9, 1993.

I hereby designate the Honorable EARL HUTTO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray using the words of Robert Grant:

The earth with its store of wonders untold,
Almighty, thy power hath founded of old,
Hath established it fast by a changeless decree,
And round it hath cast, like a mantle the sea.
Thy bountiful care, what tongue can recite?
It breathes in the air, it shines in the light;
It streams from the hills, it descends to the plain,
And sweetly distills in the dew and the rain.
Frail children of dust, and feeble as frail,
In Thee do we trust, nor find Thee to fail;
Thy mercies how tender, how firm to the end,
Our Maker, Defender, Redeemer, and Friend. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HOUGHTON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2010) "An act to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to establish a Corporation for National Service, enhance opportunities for national service, and provide national service educational awards to persons participating in such service, and for other purposes."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to announce that it will recognize 15 Members on each side for 1-minute speeches.

PUERTO RICAN STATEHOOD VOTE

(Mr. MURPHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, 1993, the people of Puerto Rico will vote on whether to become the 51st State in our Union. It will be only the second such referendum held in Puerto Rico since we annexed the island after the Spanish-American War in 1898.

Since 1952, when the United States granted Puerto Rico local autonomy, support for statehood, as measured at the ballot box, has risen steadily. In 1992 the statehood candidates have captured 20 of 29 Senate seats, 36 of 53 House seats and 54 of 78 municipalities. One of my closest comrades in the U.S. Marine Corps was a Puerto Rican.

Mr. Speaker, frequently we forget that Puerto Ricans are American citizens—patriotic, hard working, and, unfortunately, among the poorest of our citizens. Statehood can and will do much to improve the economy and their status as Americans.

The time has come for the people of Puerto Rico to decide for themselves, and I enthusiastically support their efforts to become our 51st State. I truly believe that both Puerto Rico and this Nation would be much better off if they approve statehood.

And finally, for all of those Members critical of section 936 of the IRS Code, statehood would end this multibillion dollar subsidy which many believe has cost the Treasury precious dollars and their communities scarce jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Puerto Rican self-determination and I would like to be the first Member of Congress to welcome them as a State in our Union.

GIVE NAFTA A CHANCE

(Mr. HOUGHTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, NAFTA is a big issue, with lots of disagreement, lots of numbers flying around. Labor and the far right say we are going to lose jobs; most businesses say we are going to build jobs. So the question is, where does the truth lie?

Today there are three disadvantages: one, labor is cheaper in Mexico; the tariffs are much higher for the United States products going into Mexico; and Japan and Taiwan have a terrific advantage with this maquiladora springboard into the United States.

With NAFTA, the wage disparity shrinks, tariff disparity goes away, and the dreaded maquiladora also goes away.

Mr. Speaker, this is not theory. It has always happened this way. Why? Because the United States is bigger, we have more technology, we are more resilient, and because we have a better work force. Look what happened in Canada. The trade relationship with Canada, they had higher average tariffs and a big trade surplus. We instituted the free-trade agreement and eliminated the tariffs. Our exports surged.

Mr. Speaker, it can happen. If NAFTA goes into effect, it will happen. We just have to give NAFTA a chance.

NATIONAL DAY OF THE WORKING PARENT

(Ms. SCHENK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the tremendous accomplishments of millions of working people in our country—people who, after working hard all day, come home to their primary job—parenting.

Today we commemorate the "National Day of the Working Parent,"

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

and we call for the resources to provide working families with the assistance they need to make it in today's world. Working parents need more quality time with their families, greater access to services, and more support from employers and community groups.

Today in my district in San Diego organizations are coming together, including the board of education, city officials, and community groups, such as the National Council of Jewish Women. They will pass out special "food for thought" boxes containing information on child and elder care for both parents and employers.

I commend their efforts and similar efforts throughout the country as we all recognize that the working parent is the backbone of this country.

THE GOVERNMENT IS BROKE

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, President Bill Clinton said, "The Government is broken and we intend to fix it." He was partially right.

In reality, the Government is broke, and we have to fix our spending habits. That means we should cut spending first.

AL GORE has made several excellent suggestions about reinventing Government. In fact, they are so good, Ronald Reagan's Grace Commission made them a decade ago.

The challenge is not in making recommendations. Almost every President in the last 20 years has made similar recommendations. The challenge comes in implementing those recommendations.

In my view, the best way to change the Government is to cut spending. Bureaucracies only adapt when the money supply is limited.

I applaud the President and the Vice President for taking a step in the right direction. Now, I urge them to show real leadership and cut spending first.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT PERPETRATES FRAUD IN DEMJANJUK CASE

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the saga of John Demjanjuk, accused of being the infamous Ivan the Terrible, goes on. Israel reversed that decision; he is not Ivan. Demjanjuk said he was never a Nazi; he never changed his name or appearance.

Mr. Speaker, there are more than 10 people with the name and the exact same spelling, Ivan Demjanjuk, in Ukraine. In fact, there is a member of the Ukrainian Parliament with the

exact same name. The bottom line here is now German officials say the so-called Travnik identification card is a fraud.

Where is the Constitution, Congress? Do you just charge a man in America and throw the Constitution out? The bottom line is, John Demjanjuk is not afraid to come back home and look the Justice Department in the eye. They are afraid of John Demjanjuk. And from the evidence that I have uncovered, I say the Justice Department deliberately perpetrated a hoax, a fraud, on the courts of both America and Israel, and that is a felony.

Demjanjuk will not be coming back for a walk in the park; he will be going right back into court, under the Constitution and due process, to fight for his citizenship and face those allegations straight on. That is about all we should be able to guarantee, Members, is some freedom and fairness under the Constitution.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, not long ago I received a heartbreaking letter from a woman in my district.

Her husband is a highly skilled machine builder. But he has not worked steadily in 3 years. Every time he finds a job he just gets laid off again.

They have four boys, between the ages of 3 and 16. Money is tight. They have exhausted their savings. And bills are piling up.

But their greatest fear is not about jobs or income. Their greatest fear is about health care.

She writes:

We are scared to death every time one of the kids get hurt. My 14-year-old was involved in an auto accident.

Since we don't have health insurance, they want \$300 before they will pay any bills. We just don't have it.

She summed up the problem better than any of the pundits. She wrote:

I'm not looking for a handout, but when middle class skilled trades people can't make it, something's wrong.

We need help with health care. It's urgent now.

And she is right.

We have seen all the statistics. We have heard all the stories. We cannot wait any longer.

Now is the time for health care reform.

REINVENTING GOVERNMENT

(Mr. GOODLATTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, promises, promises, promises. First,

Americans were promised a middle-class tax cut last fall. Instead, we've been hit with the largest tax increase in history. Next, Americans were promised that Federal spending was going to be dramatically slashed. Instead, domestic spending is actually going up. Now, President Clinton promises to reinvent Government. Let's hope it's not just another empty promise to be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, reducing the size of the Government is a good idea. In fact, it's such a good idea, Republicans have been pushing it for the last 50 years.

Cutting spending, especially funding for an overbloated, inefficient bureaucracy, is the key element that any reinvention must have. I urge the President and the Democrat leadership in Congress to work with Republicans to truly slash the massive Federal bureaucracy and to truly change the way they do business in Washington.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. SHEPHERD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Speaker, when I mailed a health care reform survey to the residents of my district 2 months ago, I expected a constructive and spirited response. But I did not expect the avalanche of individual health care tragedies and urgent pleas for change that continue to descend upon my office even today.

The message from my district is simple and clear: We need health care reform and we need it now. Eighty-seven percent of my constituents who responded to the survey believe that spiraling health care costs are a serious national problem, while sizable majorities support the framework of the President's forthcoming proposal, along with sin taxes to finance these changes.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents and this Nation cannot afford to wait for health care reform. I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to join me now in working with the President to return health security to our Nation's families.

CUTTING REDTAPE

(Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand the latest plan to reinvent Government. The administration says it will create a Government that works better and costs less. Great idea, and I am for it. It is entitled as going from redtape to results. I am for it. I guess everyone else is for it.

My problem is, it does not go far enough. But there are a couple of issues. One is, do we really mean it or is

this another series of campaign slogans, again.

The second is, let us get on with it. Let us not talk about it for 5 years. It is interesting to me that these plans are all 5-year plans. I thought the administration was elected for 4.

We need to get on with it. So I am for moving. Basically, we need to reduce the size of Government and the cost of Government and shift some programs and taxes from the Federal Government to the State level. I'm not familiar with everything, but I do know about a couple of these things.

One is the Minerals Management Service. I have some experience with that. We showed in a hearing this year that the States can collect those Federal royalties for \$12 a thousand. The Federal Government costs \$80. Now we are asking that that be changed. But this program's solution is to increase the penalties and impose broader fees.

That is not increased efficiency. If it is, I have kind of forgotten what that word means.

ONE YEAR LATER

(Mrs. MEEK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday President Clinton kept another promise—he returned to South Dade to visit with the victims of Hurricane Andrew. We have made much progress in the past year, but much remains to be done. Hurricane Andrew, along with the BRAC recommendation, has permanently destroyed tens of thousands of jobs. While thousands of homes have been repaired or rebuilt, thousands more remain.

The President months ago committed his administration to help us help ourselves. It took a little while to get going because the previous administration had made promises and done nothing to implement them.

The President repeated his commitment to be with us for the long haul. I wish I could report to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have completed our rebuilding, but we have a ways to go. In South Dade we do not want a handout but a hand up. We want to work in good jobs and pay taxes, not consume them.

I want to thank President Clinton for spending Labor Day with us and for repeating his promise to help us rebuild our future. He was able to see not just the work of Government but the volunteer efforts of thousands of individuals and organizations from the AFL-CIO to business groups.

One year can make a difference when promises are kept.

TOBACCO TAX

(Mr. ROGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, you would think President Clinton would be done with higher taxes after placing the largest tax increase in our country's history on the backs of American families.

Not so at the Clinton White House. Here comes health care, and with it—a massive tax increase on tobacco products.

They call it a "sin" tax. But if the new taxes on tobacco do not raise enough money, what sins are next? Twinkies? Moon Pies? Coca-Cola?

We are all committed to solving the health care crisis. I, too, look forward to helping make health care affordable and more accessible.

But singling out tobacco—a crop that employs over 100,000 people in Kentucky alone, and provides millions of dollars for our State—is unfair to rural families, and puts the burden of health care reform squarely on their backs.

Mr. Speaker, rural families will suffer enough from the Clinton gas tax. Don't add to their woes with higher taxes on tobacco.

PRESIDENT CLINTON OFFERS CHANGE

(Mr. VISCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, when an unanswered phone forces people in the northwest Indiana district I represent to take a day off from work and travel to Indianapolis only to find an inexplicably closed Federal office, something is terribly wrong. Unfortunately, this experience with the Federal Government has been repeated many times for the people of northwest Indiana.

That is why I am pleased that President Clinton and Vice President GORE have continued their efforts to change America by formulating a plan to reinvent Government to work better and cost less.

The redtape, which often binds businesses and individuals, will be cut.

The owners—the American taxpayers—will come first. The phones will be answered and the offices will be open for business.

And finally, spending will be cut and the Government will be run in an efficient, commonsense manner.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have called for change. President Clinton has—again—offered change. Let us deliver change with a Government that works better and costs less.

REINVENTING GOVERNMENT: ONE PROMISE PRESIDENT CLINTON MUST KEEP

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I have been watching as the cameras have been following Messrs. Clinton and GORE from prop to prop. They are going to reinvent Government, they say. They are going to cut the fat. They are going to streamline.

I am trying not to be skeptical. I really am.

The fact is that 60 percent of the Clinton-Gore plan can be accomplished by Executive order. Today. So I would suggest to the President that he stop mugging for the cameras and start signing those orders.

The fact is that 40 percent of the Clinton-Gore plan can be enacted by Congress. So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that you get your Democrat colleagues in line and bring this reform legislation to the floor.

Since we Republicans have been offering these reform proposals for years, we will be ready to assist in the drafting of the legislation. We are ready to go.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the President is sincere, because this is one promise he must keep.

HEALTH CARE REFORM MEANS REAL SECURITY FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's commitment to national health care reform gives this Congress an opportunity to provide real security for American families.

Any illness is a cause for concern, but serious illnesses or injuries can be emotionally and financially traumatic. Worrying about finding the right doctor and the right treatment should be enough. But in our health care system, that is only the beginning of the worries.

First, you have to hope that you are employed and remain employed, because most likely you will have no health insurance otherwise. If you work for a small business you have to worry about whether your illness will cause the insurer to drop your firm's coverage or drastically raise the premium. And, if your illness is chronic, you may now be stuck in your current job because a new firm might exclude coverage for an existing health problem.

We need a health system that eliminates these worries for everyone and lets us concentrate on what is important—getting healthy. President Clinton's commitment to national health reform gives this Congress an opportunity to address the real needs of American families.

WITHDRAW TROOPS FROM SOMALIA

(Mr. MICA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I asked my colleagues in July and August to withdraw United States military forces from Somalia.

Now in September, as the other body debates United States military presence in Somalia, I ask the leadership and my colleagues to give this important policy matter a fair hearing in the House.

Do not turn your back as we spend \$10 in military aid in Somalia for every \$1 in humanitarian aid.

Do not turn your back as we get more deeply involved in a civil war.

Do not turn your back as we ship Pakistanis, Americans, and this week Nigerians home in body bags—all in a clouded, confused, and questionable mission.

This week we learned that U.N. forces are taking sides with Somalia factions while other U.N. soldiers are being murdered.

Last week we raided our own U.N. mission. What travesty will next week bring?

Today, as administration officials scurry about the Congress worrying about saving face in Somalia, I think it is time the House of Representatives faced up to this issue.

INTRODUCTION OF LABELING BILL

(Mr. KLINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, have you ever opened a package that said "Made in the U.S.A." only to find that the contents were labeled "made in Taiwan"?

If that sort of abuse makes you and your constituents see red when you should be seeing red, white, and blue, you might want to cosponsor legislation that I am introducing today to penalize the fraudulent use of "Made in America" labels and require products with foreign content to be labeled to that effect.

Products with "Made in the U.S.A." labels would have to be registered with the Department of Commerce, at least 60 percent of the product must be manufactured in the United States and the final assembly of the product must take place in the United States.

In addition, my bill would assess a \$100,000 fine for the fraudulent use of "Made in America" labels.

It would also allow the Secretary of Commerce to seek injunctive relief for fraudulent use.

Finally, my legislation would require products made overseas or products assembled in the United States with for-

eign content to be labeled to indicate the proportion of the product that is of foreign origin and what country it is from.

Realistically, Congress cannot mandate the purchase of American-made products, but we can and should encourage it.

And we can make sure that products that claim to be made in America really are.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation to protect American jobs.

A CONFLICT OF NUMBERS

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, do you remember when President Clinton came before the House and told us that the only budget numbers we could believe were those generated by the Congressional Budget Office? Mr. Speaker, do you remember when the Democrats told us that their economic plan would cut the budget deficit by \$500 billion? It turns out that those two things that were said before the Congress do not match up.

The Congressional Budget Office released a report yesterday indicating that the economic plan passed by the Democrats just before this House left on the August recess, using the Congressional Budget Office's own baseline, is only going to reduce the budget deficit by \$433 billion over the 5-year period that they claim, and it also turns out that \$433 billion, \$241 billion of that came from increased taxes, and only \$192 billion came from lower entitlement and discretionary spending and interest savings.

In other words, the Congressional Budget Office just wrote off what the Democrats told us time and time again on the floor when they passed the economic plan. The fact is that every Democrat who voted for the President's economic plan defrauded America on the numbers. The Democrats are hoping that middle-class America will overlook that fraud, but the numbers speak for themselves and the middle-class Americans paying the higher taxes are not about to overlook the big new tax bill that will not bring the deficit reduction that they were promised.

NATIONAL WORKING PARENT DAY

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today is National Working Parent Day. This has been a country with a real attitude about working parents. The attitude is, if you are a parent you ought to work, but if you work, we do not want to hear about you being a parent.

It has caused all sorts of stress on America's families, and today the National Council of Jewish Women and the Marriott Corp. have launched this day all over America to start talking about how we make America's workplace much more family friendly. It is long overdue. We are the worst of all industrialized nations on this issue.

I am pleased that there will be rallies everywhere. First we can celebrate the passage of the Family Leave Act that happened earlier, but we must also work on the tax code, which is very unfamily friendly.

Imagine, you do better raising a thoroughbred dog or horse than you do a child under the tax code. Imagine, there is a marriage penalty that only gets deeper when you are under our tax code. There is something wrong with that. Let us work on that.

I am thankful for beginning this day. I hope everybody gets out and starts trying to change America's attitude on working families.

LONG ON PROMISE, SHORT ON PERFORMANCE

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week the Vice President presented his report on reinventing Government. I cannot imagine anyone being anything but supportive of such an effort. At the same time, I cannot imagine anyone being anything but skeptical.

Reinventing Government does not necessarily mean reducing Government. It will not do us any good to cut Government here only to see it grow there. It is hard to believe this administration does not intend to do just that.

Until yesterday, the White House's solution to every problem has been another Federal program, more Federal spending, and more taxes to pay for them.

However, 60 percent of the GORE report can be accomplished by Executive order of the President, but in 8 months zero percent has been done. In the Senate, AL GORE had a zero rating from Citizens Against Government Waste. And now we are supposed to believe that the President and Vice President have become Government reformers.

That is why I am supportive but skeptical of the Gore report. So far this administration has been long on promise, but short on performance.

URGING COSPONSORSHIP OF THE BIENNIAL BUDGETING RESOLUTION

(Mr. HUTTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUTTO. Madam Speaker, I want to join others in commending the Vice President of the United States, Mr. GORE, for his reinvent Government proposals. Some good proposals have been made. One of the best is that he advocates biennial budgeting. Earlier this year the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and I introduced a biennial budgeting resolution. I hope the Members will join us in cosponsoring this measure.

It is no secret that Government spending is out of control, with annual large deficits and a national debt to prove it. I believe we need oversight of these programs. A 2-year budget cycle would give us more time for evaluating which programs are really working for America, and determining where cuts should be made.

□ 1030

A biennial budget cycle would provide more long-range fiscal planning and reduce Government spending and a biennial budget cycle would discourage agencies from spending all they have got so that they can get more next time.

So, Mr. Speaker, our present annual budget cycle does not encourage the frugal use of Government funds. It is time that we change their. So I ask for all Members to cosponsor and support our legislation for a biennial budget.

WE ARE ALL FOR REINVENTING GOVERNMENT

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, the President and Vice President have struck a resonant chord with the American people who know that we must rein in the reign of arrogance in Government. It is the same chord Presidents Carter, Reagan, and Bush hit to deflate the bloated bureaucracy, to cancel the purchase orders for \$700 screwdrivers and \$900 toilet seats, to replace unwarranted perks and services with clear accounting and good Government services.

Pogo used to say we have met the enemy and he is us. No gender discrimination intended here.

This has new meaning in Congress, and I congratulate President Clinton for pointing it out.

What are we going to do? "Let's listen to the people," Vice President GORE tells us. That is a good idea.

The message is to cut wasteful funding first. Remember those jammed switchboards during the budget debate? Let us listen and act. Let us turn off the spigot of dollars flowing to unnecessary programs and the political pay-offs and profligate perks, and Government will get smaller.

It is not too late to reinvent and repeal the \$250 billion of new taxes that

President Clinton has loaded on us. For that matter, it is not too late to reinvent the Boston Tea Party. That struck a chord we all heard.

CONGRATULATIONS TO VICE PRESIDENT GORE

(Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations to Vice President GORE and President Clinton on their proposal for reinventing Government.

This proposal is a firm step in the direction we need to go to get Government working for the people.

I ask my Republican and Democratic colleagues to join together in bipartisan support to put this program on the front burner. This is not a Democratic or Republican idea. It is a sensible idea that will cut redtape, put people first, and empower Government employees to get the job done.

At the same time the program will save the taxpayers more than \$108 billion. It will streamline the bureaucracy and it will make Government more effective and responsive to the taxpayers we were elected to serve.

These results will not be achieved overnight, but we need to work together, improve the plan, but most importantly move it forward.

I chaired the audit committee in the Wisconsin State Legislature which addressed some of these issues at the State level. My experience there leads me to believe that we need Government to focus on the modern philosophy of management that has been adopted by private industry.

Mr. Speaker, we need to take these bold kinds of steps and I hope that my colleagues will join me with their support of this innovative proposal.

IT IS TIME TO DEAL WITH CRIME IN AMERICA

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that the American people are cynical and losing confidence in government? Their cynicism and pessimism is justified.

I too find myself shaking my head in disbelief. What happened to our beloved America? I sat in front of my television set overnight and watched, shook my head in disbelief, and yet over and over again we heard the story of yet another foreign tourist gunned down in Miami.

But do you know what? It was not only the horrible realization that it was yet another tourist. The shock was and the realization was that in any

given week Americans by the scores are being killed randomly. But few seem shocked, and the media hardly notices. The police and the media move in to high gear, as with this incident, but when Americans are shot down it is another day at the office.

The President and Congress have only been giving lip service to crime control and making our streets safe. Where is the crime package? Where is the war on drugs? Where is the Brady bill?

Let us get on with it. I ask the President to give us leadership and I ask you, my colleagues, to get behind the crime bill.

MAKING GOVERNMENT WORK BETTER

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, most of us can remember several years ago when President Reagan appointed the Grace Commission. Mr. Grace came through with a series of recommendations for trying to streamline government and to achieve many of the things which we all hope will be achieved to cut the cost of government.

We also recall that the day after the Grace Commission report Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger said that he was not going to follow its recommendations. That was a significant statement because many of the recommendations for change were in the Department of Defense.

Nevertheless, some were made by Congress, some by the administration, and some progress was made in an effort to meet the Grace Commission guidelines.

I would like to congratulate Vice President GORE and President Clinton for this new report which tries to get us moving forward again in creating a government that works better and costs less. This reinventing government is a challenge to Congress as well. Congress is either going to catch this wave of reform, or it is going to be drowned by it, because it is time that we stopped business as usual.

What Vice President GORE has done is to challenge us to look anew at the way government delivers its services. I am confident that we can work together in a bipartisan fashion to achieve that.

ADULT LITERACY

(Mr. REGULA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, the United States is part of a highly competitive global economy, a world market that rewards high quality products

and services. The key to competitiveness in this global economy is the human mind, its ingenuity and ability to innovate.

But, in today's Washington Post, we read that there are 90 million adults in our Nation who are, in some way, illiterate. The article states that, "Nearly half of all adult Americans read and write so poorly that it is difficult for them to hold a decent job. . . ."

American children do poorly in school, there are no school-to-work transition programs, American employers invest far less in worker training than do their competitors in other industrial nations, people who need to go back to school do not, and the effort Congress has made to address the problem of illiteracy has been fragmented.

And, yet, literacy affects the very core of this country. The quality of life, cycles of poverty and welfare, the education of our children—all of these depend on the education of our people.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of illiteracy should be a number one priority for a partnership of Federal, State, and local government along with the private sector.

TRIBUTE TO UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SPIRIT OF TROY TROJAN MARCHING BAND

(Mr. COX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, as an alumnus of the University of Southern California, I am proud to rise in the House of Representatives today to pay tribute to Dr. Art Bartner and the University of Southern California Spirit of Troy Trojan Marching Band. Many of the members of the band and Dr. Bartner himself are with us today in the Chamber in the gallery.

The Trojan Marching Band is a student operated and staffed organization consisting of over 300 musicians representing more than 60 fields of undergraduate and graduate study. It was established in 1880 and has grown since that time to become the largest spirit band in the entire State of California.

It represents the University of Southern California throughout the country and overseas. During its over 100 years of existence, the Trojan Marching Band has performed for 12 United States Presidents. They have also participated in the Inaugural Marching Band and in the dedication ceremony of the Richard M. Nixon Library.

In 1984, the Trojan Marching Band added to the Olympic spirit in Los Angeles by participating in the All-American Marching Band, a key part of the 23rd Olympiad. And in the summer of 1990, the Trojan Marching Band played a historic concert at the Brandenburg Gate after the fall of the Berlin Wall.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the USC Trojan Marching Band for their musical talent and their dynamic spirit.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUTTO). Members will be advised not to refer or give recognition to those in the gallery.

NO NEW TAXES

(Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the administration indicated that it plans to increase excise taxes significantly. Before we venture down the path of higher taxes yet again, I hope my colleagues will consider the message most of us heard while we were home.

The American people are tired of higher taxes and bigger government. I held town hall meetings in each of the 16 counties in my district. At every one of these meetings, I was asked how Congress could justify higher taxes with nothing to show for it.

The fact is that excise taxes on gasoline already cost rural consumers like the ones in my district 52 percent more than they do urban consumers. Rural consumers also pay a 44 percent higher excise tax burden on tobacco and 26 percent higher burden on utilities, according to a recent Auburn University study.

Mr. Speaker, higher taxes are bad for the economy. Higher excise taxes hurt rural consumers. President Clinton just got the highest tax increase in history passed through Congress. Is it not time we gave the citizens of this country a break?

Let us all take the no tax pledge.

□ 1040

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUTTO). Pursuant to House Resolution 246 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2401.

□ 1041

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2401) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to pre-

scribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes, with Mr. DURBIN (chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, September 8, 1993, amendment No. 3 printed in part 1 of House Report 103-223 offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] had been disposed of.

TRIDENT II (D-5) MISSILE

Pursuant to House Resolution 246, it is now in order to debate the subject matter of the Trident II (D-5) missile.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 15 minutes and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we now begin 30 minutes of debate on the Trident II D-5 missile. In order to set the stage, let me point out to my colleagues that at the end of general debate there will be three amendments presented to the House. The first amendment will be the Dellums-Penny-Woolsey amendment that would terminate procurement of the D-5 missile, followed by an amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], that would eliminate advanced procurement for the D-5 missile. Finally, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], that would require a study of the D-5 program by April 1.

Having set the stage for this part of the debate on the fiscal year 1994 DOD authorization bill, let me now make a few comments.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I rise today to share with my colleagues my reasons for why we should end production of the D-5 nuclear missile in fiscal year 1994.

Most of the arguments you hear about the D-5 are that it is an effective missile, the backbone of our strategic deterrent, and so forth. Mr. Chairman, that argument in this gentleman's humble opinion is not relevant. The debate is not over whether we should have any in our arsenal—the fact is we already do—but rather how many we should have. This amendment does not say no D-5's at all. It just says buying 295 is enough, we do not need more of them with today's tight budget, in the post-cold war world that has radically changed.

No one is saying we should take the D-5's we now have or soon will have and grind them into dust. That may indeed be a good idea. But we just do not need any more at this time. We desperately need the billions that more D-5's will cost to use for deficit reduction

and the needs of the citizens of this country.

We have at this time 249 D-5's delivered or on order and over 400 C-4 missiles. Russia wants to join NATO, our deficit is running at terrifying levels, and yet we are told we should continue to spend \$1 billion per year on the D-5 nuclear missile for the rest of this decade and well into the next. What a tragic waste of scarce federal resources!

According to the Navy, we need at least 133 more D-5 missiles. Instead of paying billions of borrowed dollars to do this, we should consider the following steps:

No. 1, by keeping our D-5's with eight warheads each, instead of downloading them to four, we could still have the same 96 warheads per Trident submarine that the Navy says it needs, but it would require 120 fewer D-5's. This is almost all of the 133 the pentagon says it wants.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this may seem like a pie-in-the-sky option, but the fact of the matter is that this option was under active consideration by the previous administration. Indeed, in point of fact, former Secretary of Defense Cheney so stated in testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee in the other body in the summer of 1992. As a matter of fact, he specifically stated:

We are still wrestling with and have not made the final decision yet as a department whether we will actually downgrade warheads on missiles to comply with START-II or whether we will downgrade missiles on boats. We could achieve the same result by 18 missiles instead of 24.

So that option is a very real option.

No. 2, by reducing the D-5 flight test rate to the same pace as that used by the Air Force for its strategic missiles, the Navy would need 60 fewer D-5's. Third possibility: reducing the START-II overall warhead ceiling from 3,500 to 2,500 and any time in the next 20 years could indeed lower the Navy's D-5 requirement by up to 125 missiles, nearly all of the 133 they say they want.

The administration tries to scare us into thinking that we should not act because we would "open Pandora's box on the START Treaty." This, in this gentleman's opinion, is a scare tactic. As they have said elsewhere, military and fiscal considerations are more important than arms control on the question of the D-5 and START. They are using START as a smokescreen to scare people from taking a close look at this issue. If you were to go to your constituents and ask them whether they would want the Government to buy as many as 325 more cold war nuclear missiles for \$15 billion or to use that money to reduce the deficit and putting people back to work, what do you think they would say, Mr. Chairman? To ask the question, I believe, is to answer it.

Mr. Chairman and Members of this body, the cold war is over. We do not need to spend billions on weapons that are not needed. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment at the appropriate point in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support for a program that is critical to U.S. national security, the Trident II [D-5] sea-launched ballistic missile [SLBM]. Specifically, I rise in opposition to an amendment to H.R. 2401 to be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] to terminate production of the D-5 in fiscal year 1994. In addition, I rise in opposition to the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] to delete funding in H.R. 2401 for advanced procurement for the D-5 missile. I do support, however, the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] to permit the expenditure of funds for the D-5 beginning on October 1 of this year.

Mr. Chairman, under the START I and II arms reduction treaties, the United States is required to dramatically reduce the number of strategic warheads in its arsenal. The administration has decided to place the bulk of the remaining U.S. warheads in the stabilizing and more survivable submarine leg of the strategic triad. Relying more heavily on SLBM's requires the United States to produce enough D-5 missiles to equip the 10 Atlantic Ocean strategic submarines configured to carry the D-5. In pursuit of this objective, DOD has requested the funds necessary to procure an additional 24 D-5 missiles in fiscal year 1994.

Terminating D-5 missile production now would force a choice between two equally undesirable options: (1) send submarines to sea with empty launch tubes, or (2) conduct costly modifications to the new Atlantic Ocean Trident submarines so as to permit them to employ the aging and less capable C-4 missile whose service life is limited—an option that could end up costing more than procuring the additional D-5 missiles. Either option will impose severe operational disadvantages and will create substantial inefficiencies in the overall U.S. strategic program.

Terminating D-5 production would also complicate U.S. arms control efforts. In fact, the Clinton administration strongly opposes any effort to reopen either START treaty to amendments—as would be required if the Dellums amendment were to become law. As President Clinton noted in a letter I received on August 2:

Some have suggested that the United States could save money by simply deploying half as many D-5 missiles on each Trident submarine while doubling the number

of warheads carried by each missile. In other words, instead of having each submarine carry 24 missiles, each of which would be armed with 4 warheads, we would deploy only 12 D-5s on each Trident while having each missile carry 8 warheads.

There are a number of major problems with this "de-tubing" proposal. First, we have negotiated the START II Treaty on the assumption that each D-5 would be attributed as carrying 4 warheads, not eight. Second, under START rules the 12 "empty" missile tubes one each submarine would count as though they were each occupied by a D-5 missile with four warheads. As a result, this approach would place the United States in violation of the START II warhead ceilings unless we obtained permission from our treaty partners to change the Treaty.

Unfortunately, a U.S. proposal along these lines would open a Pandora's box in terms of inviting counterproposals by our START partners for relief from other treaty dismantlement requirements they find onerous. If the United States were to ask Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan for permission to revise or eliminate the strict START SLBM launcher elimination procedures, each of these states would likely demand a quid pro quo in areas under both START and CFE where they are already pressing us to simplify or waive weapons elimination requirements. The result would be an unraveling of the meticulously negotiated dismantlement procedures contained in both accords, with an attendant degradation in the irreversibility of those agreements.

Here is what chairman of the Joint Chiefs Gen. Colin Powell said about the D-5 missile in a July 27 letter:

The D-5 missile on Trident submarines will be the backbone of U.S. strategic deterrent forces [under START II] ***. I do not support the proposal to renegotiate the terms of the START II Treaty with Russia to allow either country to decrease the number of missiles carried by a submarine ***. I believe that production of the D-5 should not be prematurely terminated. The vast majority of the Trident investment is behind us, and procuring the remaining missiles for Atlantic Ocean Trident submarines will ensure a credible deterrent force well into the 21st Century.

Secretary of Defense Les Aspin also strongly opposes the Dellums amendment. According to a July 19 letter I received from Secretary Aspin:

Terminating D-5 missile production now would shut down the only operating strategic ballistic missile production line in the United States. Sustaining a low rate of D-5 production, and the associated industrial and technology bases, provides a key and unique hedge against future uncertainties ***. Continued D-5 production is, therefore, essential to the future health of our deterrent capability. I strongly urge your continued support for this critical program.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons I strongly support the Trident II [D-5] missile program, and urge my colleagues to vote "No" on the Dellums and Abercrombie amendments to terminate production of the D-5 missile.

□ 1050

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY], who is also a coauthor of an

amendment that will come before the body at the end of the general debate.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, the cold war is over, the cold war is over, the cold war is over. Mr. Chairman, we have heard this phrase repeatedly as we have debated defense spending here in the House of Representatives. But, while we keep hearing about the cold war being over, Mr. Chairman, Congress is failing to translate this message into sound peacetime spending policies.

Mr. Chairman, the cold war is over, but we still have a cold war defense budget—\$30 billion more in 1994 dollars than were budgeted in 1975. The cold war is over, and we are still being asked to pay \$10 billion for the Trident D-5, a relic from a past era no longer needed to penetrate targets in the former Soviet Union.

In this new era, we must spend our scarce dollars on the important domestic issues that have been neglected over the past 12 years. Thirty seven million people are going without health care, and programs like Head Start are not fully funded, because we choose to spend money on unnecessary weapons instead of our children. Later this year, Congress will consider health care reform, education reform, welfare reform, and worker retraining. I would hate to go home and tell the people of Marin and Sonoma Counties in California's 6th Congressional District, that we failed to deal with these problems because we voted to spend \$10 billion on the Trident D-5 nuclear missile. I would much rather tell them that this money will be used to cut the deficit and invest in worker retraining.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for the issues we were all elected for in 1992, and to join Chairman DELLUMS, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] and myself in voting to eliminate this wasteful spending program and invest in our country's future.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from California who just spoke. The cold war is over. During the cold war we had something called the Triad system. During the Triad we had bombers, we had land-based missiles, and we also had sea-based missiles.

Now, you know, we do not have those anymore. The Triad system of the cold war is over, so we have decided not to use bombers anymore and most of our land-based missiles are being closed up at this particular time.

So the agreement we have come up with leaves us with one thing. That is all we have got, Mr. Chairman, one thing left, as I see it, that has a nuclear deterrent, and that is the Trident

submarine in the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans. Please keep in mind that 70 percent of the world is covered with water. I think our negotiators were smart to put it on a basis where we had it in a Trident missile.

Now, keep in mind also that we have given up on a number of missiles in the past. They are no longer part of it. The one the gentleman from South Carolina spoke of, the C-4, is in the Atlantic Fleet at this time.

Was the C-4 ever intended to be our first line of defense? The answer is no. The C-4 was a temporary missile waiting to come up with the D-5. So the D-5 is now the issue in front of us.

So when we have only one thing left, all our eggs in one basket, it only seems reasonable to me that we use the one thing we have got, the best thing we have got.

You cannot compare missiles to missiles. We are talking apples and oranges. The D-5 is far superior to the C-4 or the missiles we had before, so we have to be very, very careful as we get into this situation.

We no longer have nuclear bombers on alert. The strategic role has all but disappeared. Our land-based force is being reduced. The Peacekeeper which contributed to bringing the changes in the former Soviet Union is being inactivated. Minuteman II's are being eliminated. Minuteman III's are approaching the end of their original design life cycle and are nowhere near as accurate as the D-5.

Please take a look at the GAO evaluation of the Strategic Triad. It outlines how expensive it would be to restart a D-5 line in the future. They say it would be extremely short-sighted. Every defense official that I have talked to, and that I have heard of, Gen. Colin Powell, Gen. Lee Butler and the Strategic Force Command, to Secretary Les Aspin have testified and written strong letters of support for the D-5 program.

And one other person we should all take heed to at this time by the name of William Clinton has said that he thinks it would be foolish to do away with the D-5 missile.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would say what we have left is the D-5. We are not in a position of saying we have the Triad.

I agree the cold war is over, but I would like to remind people of the statement that the Director of the CIA likes to make, Jim Woolsey. He makes the statement:

The Soviet Union was a big dragon out in the jungle. Now it has dropped and fallen apart, and now there are 50 poisonous snakes.

I would worry about the 50 poisonous snakes, if I were the people voting on this today. Keep in mind those snakes can be just as devastating, just as powerful, just as hard as the Soviet Union, and the best deterrent we have got is our sea-based Trident D-5 missile

which we would like to put in the Atlantic Ocean, as it is in the Pacific Ocean.

I have such great respect for the chairman of the committee and what he states about this, but Mr. Chairman, in this case let us vote to keep the D-5 alive.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

First, let me respond to my colleague by saying that to contemplate fighting a nuclear war, in this gentleman's opinion, is the height of madness. What we ought to be about is deterrence, not the actual use of these weapons.

To talk about no longer having a Triad, I would remind my colleagues that we still have 500 Minuteman missiles. We still have 20 B-2's nuclear equipped. We still have 96 B-1's nuclear equipped. We still have 95 B-52's nuclear equipped.

Mr. Chairman, with those remarks, I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], a supporter of the Dellums amendment.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Dellums-Penny-Klug-Woolsey-Morella-Inslee amendment, which we will consider after this general debate. This amendment, as has been stated, will reduce spending on the D-5 missile program by \$1.2 billion in fiscal year 1994. Half of the savings will go to further reducing the deficit, with the other half dedicated to Defense conversion programs.

The D-5 missile is a weapon conceived in the cold war with no practical purpose in the post-cold war era. Our security no longer requires a multi-layered hard target capability to counter a Soviet arsenal. Moreover, the Navy already has D-5 missiles in sufficient numbers to run up against the submarine-launched ballistic missile warhead limits agreed to in the START I and START II Treaties. In addition, the amendment which will be offered will allow for deployment of D-5 missiles already produced, resulting in a D-5 deployment which the Congressional Budget Office determined earlier this year to be sufficient to deter nuclear war.

The Dellums-Penny-Klug-Woolsey-Morella-Inslee amendment will bring about not only an immediate savings in fiscal year 1994, but it will also save \$10 billion in procurement costs over the next several years, not including the interest costs on the money that we would need to borrow to pay for continued procurement. I urge Members to support the amendment when it is offered.

□ 1100

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, first of all, a word of congratulations to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], and the ranking member, and to the distinguished staff of the committee. I think they are doing a great job, and I enjoy the fact that we can come to the floor of the House of Representatives and have a spirited debate on these very important national security issues, and the chairman and I have had these debates over the years. He has won some, and I won some, but I always look forward to it, and I appreciate the fact that we can come here, and engage each other, and discuss important national security issues.

On the question of the D-5 missile, Mr. Chairman, I would just say to my colleagues that I understand that some people feel the cold war is over, and yet the reality is that the former Soviet Union and the four new Republics still possess 10,000 nuclear weapons that have not yet been dismantled. I hope and pray that their leadership will remain in the hands of Mr. Yeltsin and the democrats, et cetera, but that is anything but certain.

I would also point out to my colleagues, as the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] did, that we are taking down almost every single strategic program we have. We have ended the Peacekeeper missile. We are taking down our Minuteman III's from three warheads to one warhead. We are eliminating the small ICBM. We have canceled the SRAM II. We have eliminated the W-88 warhead. We have today one single strategic ballistic missile system under production, and that is the D-5 for the Trident submarine.

Mr. Chairman, I will later today offer an amendment which I think corrects a mistake that was made in this bill. The bill would have a study that would cause a production line interruption, and, according to the Navy, this would cause a serious escalation in cost of this missile. We are going to have a debate on this issue, up or down, on D-5, but after that is done I hope, if the House decides, as I expect that it will, that the D-5 should go forward, then I would hope that we could, under the Dicks amendment, correct the problems.

Basically what I say, Mr. Chairman, is:

Let's have a study that looks at the cost effectiveness of D-5's on the Pacific submarines and D-5's as compared to the C-4's for those Pacific submarines; and, No. 2, during that timeframe we would not break the production line. So, we would have the study, we would get the benefit of the study without breaking the production line, and that is basically what my amendment does.

However, Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to reject both the Del-

lums amendment and the Abercrombie amendment. I think we need to stay with the D-5 missile. It is our one strategic modernization that we still have in place. The world has changed, but we are still not yet confident of what is going to happen to those Russian Republics, and frankly we all support the D-5 and the Trident Program because it was the most cost effective, the most survivable system. If we are talking about, as my colleagues know, having a system, that is the one that makes the most sense to me, and we should not prejudice whether we take the C-4, fix it up, or put the D-5 on the Pacific Tridents. It may be less expensive to do D-5 modernization on the Pacific Tridents than to upgrade the C-4.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments that will be offered by the distinguished chairman and the gentleman from Hawaii.

Continued procurement of the D-5 missile is absolutely essential to our future strategic deterrent capabilities.

Those who want to stop production of this particular weapon system argue that we do not need any more since the cold war is over and since purse strings are tightening.

Yes, the cold war is over and the Soviet Union is no more, but many of the nuclear weapons that existed in the former Soviet Union still exist—and they exist in the hands of much less stable governments than the one that used to be run with an iron hand out of the Kremlin.

In an unstable world, strategic deterrent is still critical to America's defense, and the D-5 and Trident fleet are critical to that deterrent.

Additionally, stopping procurement now might very well force us to reopen negotiations on the START II Treaty. President Clinton has stated that some of the alternatives suggested by those who want to end procurement of the D-5 would do just that, and he is opposed to it.

Joint Chiefs Chairman Colin Powell calls the D-5 the backbone of U.S. strategic deterrent forces, and is opposed to terminating procurement.

Defense Secretary Les Aspin, has said continued D-5 production provides a key and unique hedge against future uncertainties.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the amendments to halt procurement of the D-5 missile.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina

[Mr. SPENCE] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, it has been stated on the floor here that there are 295 D-5's currently procured. In fact, there are 235 procured in an inventory. The balance have been used or expended in testing. The request this year is for 1,128,000,000. That will buy 24 more missiles. It will also fund \$145 million for fiscal year 1995 advanced procurement, and, if that is knocked out by the Abercrombie amendment, we are effectively stopping this program in fiscal year 1994. If our chairman's amendment is adopted, we will effectively stop it after this fiscal year.

What happens? If we stop the D-5 Program at 235 missiles, as our chairman would propose, or at 259 missiles, as the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] would have, then we are short of the Navy's requirement by a significant amount. The Navy says that they need, in order to accommodate the 10 boats in the Atlantic which will be outfitted and built custom-made to take the Trident II missile, they will need 428 Tridents.

Let me explain why 428. There are 24 tubes on each Trident II missile submarine. Each of those tubes obviously carries one missile—24 times 10 is 240. That is a basic requirement.

In addition, the Navy needs about 15 missiles for King's Bay, GA. When a missile turns up defective in a tube, they need to take one out and have a backup missile ready to insert in its place.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the Navy has used a number of missiles and will need several more for certification. The number there is 35.

And finally this missile is tested periodically, and not just to test a missile, but test the whole system, the submarine, the crew, and everything, and since this will be the key strategic deterrent of the United States for years to come, it is critically important that it be tested rigorously, and the Navy says they need to test six missiles a year, the missile, the submarine, the crew, and everything. That comes to 138 missiles.

I say to my colleagues, If you add those together, 240 plus 15 backup missiles, plus 35 for test certification, plus 138, that is 428 missiles. If we vote for this amendment, the Dellums amendment, we will stop at 235, far short of the 428 requirement. If we vote for the Abercrombie missile amendment, we will stop at 259 missiles, far short still of the 428 requirement.

Now the implication is that we can just take the C-4 missile and stick it in the tubes, that it is already a substitute for the D-5 missile. Let me tell my colleagues why that is not so. The C-4 is 10 inches narrower in diameter, and the C-4 weighs 73 pounds versus 130,000 pounds for the D-5. It does not fit in the D-5 tube, and so five boats at

least, maybe more, will have to be re-tubed, which means that the whole submarine will have to be reconfigured. The cost computed by the Navy is \$350 million.

By the way, the last thing we want to do is take these contracts to Electric Boat, reopen the contract in a firm which has dwindling business, and start negotiating the price all over again. This is not a cost saver.

Let me make one more point. It has been stated that the additional cost to complete is \$10 billion. The cost to procure all of these missiles is \$4.4 billion if we add up all the procurement accounts over the next number of years to be procured.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY], a member of the committee.

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I support the President's request to procure 24 D-5 missiles in fiscal year 1994.

Under START II, U.S. strategic defense will rely more heavily on sub-launched ballistic missiles.

With cutbacks and downsizing, it makes sense to ensure that our remaining defenses are trustworthy, capable, and reliable. The bottom-up review found that: 24 D-5's in fiscal year 1994 is necessary even to equip only 10 Tridents—rather than the 18 Tridents actually under consideration.

Twenty-four D-5's in fiscal year 1994 is necessary even if we lower the rate of test firings below accepted levels.

After next year, requirements remain unclear and depend on a number of factors that are difficult to predict.

These factors range from general uncertainty in the world to the size of the test program.

For the time being, however, the requirement is clear and the President made the right decision.

The D-5 is the only strategic missile currently in production, and continued production hedges against uncertainty.

Cutting D-5 removes one of the only incentives for Russia to continue complying with START.

Finally, we are not in this alone. Cutting production forces the United Kingdom to change their plans to equip their own Trident Force.

I urge my colleagues to support the President's request, and oppose amendments to terminate production of the D-5.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, in order to close the debate on this side of the aisle, I yield the final 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, during debate on the recently approved reconciliation bill, I heard it said—time and time again—of the budgetary constraints that gripped our Nation and limited our ability to address important social needs. I have already heard mentioned—time and time again—that we may have to take a second look at this year's appropriations bills because more cuts must be found.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I submit that, if we are still looking for areas to cut spending, the D-5 missile is the best place to start and the Dellums amendment is the best approach to follow. This very sensible amendment would terminate procurement of the D-5 intended for Trident 2 submarines after 1993.

According to the Office of Management and Budget, the Dellums amendment will produce savings of \$1.2 billion in fiscal year 1994, an nearly \$10 billion by the year 2000. The amendment wisely allocates half of these savings to deficit reduction and half to economic conversion, thus balancing the needs of a sound defense policy with the needs of a sound budget policy.

Let me remind my colleagues that the termination of the D-5 proposed in this amendment would in no way inhibit U.S. ability to defend its borders or deter threats. The D-5 is a submarine launched missile that was designed to blow up the Soviet Union. Well, the Soviet Union has blown up on its own. Our Nation no longer needs this cold war dinosaur.

I urge my colleagues to come to terms with the defense realities of 1993, to support increased funding for economic conversion and job training, and to support a most reasonable deficit reduction effort by supporting the Dellums amendment on the D-5 missile.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, for years, we have seen a concerted effort to undermine modernization of our strategic triad.

First, it was the MX. Unstable, unreliable, they said. We already have adequate systems to deliver nuclear weapons. I read a quote from the debate in 1989 against MX:

As far as mobile systems are concerned, we already have many of those. We have three types of systems we are going forward with. We have our submarines, the best force in the triad, three types of bombers, and we are going to have possibly the Midgetman.

Then it was the bomber upgrades. In addition to citing technical program problems, the critics once again argued that we have other effective delivery systems to deliver nuclear warheads on target.

After years of congressional wrangling over this issue, the Bush administration announced an unprecedented shutdown of nuclear forces. But we did so knowing we had finally made progress on other arms reductions agreements with the Soviets and with the confidence that we could finally achieve mutually verifiable strategic arms reductions with the Soviets.

In January 1992, President Bush terminated MX. He took our bombers off alert status. It was the most dramatic action taken toward nuclear drawdown in history. That year, Congress halted production of the B-2 bombers. All major accomplishments in the arms control arena.

There have been efforts in the past to kill the Trident D-5, but they have failed miserably. But now that all the other systems have been terminated, we're back to slay the last

dragon. The sea leg of the triad is the only one left with a warm production line, so some in this body are going to insist that we go after it, too. No matter that it was always the Trident force which was used to justify elimination of other strategic modernization programs.

I want to read a quote from our former colleague, Charlie Bennett, the recently-retired Chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee. During the D-5 debate in 1989, he said:

This body has rejected attempts to halt production of the D-5 missile seven times in recent years. Why is this so? Simply put, it is because the D-5 can carry either greater payloads or equivalent payloads to longer ranges than its predecessor, thereby providing a much greater scope of opportunities that mean greater flexibility and survivability for our strategic forces.

Well, my friends as we have continued to reject attempts to kill D-5 production since that time. And we should do so today. Because of cost considerations and sound policy reasons, we have all but abandoned our efforts to modernize the air and land legs of the triad. As Secretary Aspin said in his recent letter, the United States will rely more heavily on submarine launched ballistic missiles [SLBM's] under START II. He says ending production of D-5 would eliminate incentives for Russia to implement both START I and START II. Colin Powell says that the D-5 missiles on the Trident submarines will be the backbone of the U.S. strategic deterrent forces in the START II environment. President Clinton has echoed these sentiments, warning that efforts to undermine the Trident Program could jeopardize START progress and open a Pandora's box in terms of inviting counterproposals by our START partners for relief from other treaty dismantlement requirements they find onerous.

The President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Secretary of Defense have all cautioned us that termination of D-5 could have significant consequences for progress on arms reductions and dismantlement. They all believe that D-5 is absolutely essential to our strategic deterrent.

Those who believe the cold war is over should take the time to learn how fragile the arms reduction process is, and to understand that significant progress does not equal complete success. We must heed the advice of our leaders who are dealing firsthand with strategic deterrence and arms reductions, and reject amendments to kill D-5.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to day to share with my colleagues why I think we can safely bring to a close our program of building D-5 submarine launched missiles after we buy a final 24 in fiscal year 1994. My amendment would eliminate \$145 million for advanced procurement of the D-5—Trident II—missile.

Most arguments you will hear about the D-5 will tell you that it is highly effective and the backbone of our strategic deterrent.

Mr. Chairman, you can agree with both of those statements and still vote for this amendment. This amendment does not say that the D-5 is a bad weapon. We thank the Navy for a job well done, but we must recognize, that in this era of budget cuts we just do not need to spend billions on still more missiles.

The current D-5/C-4 inventory exceeds 650, and the Department of Defense Weapon

Support Improvement Group reports that the C-4's will last 23 more years or until the year 2016.

No one is saying we should throw away or get rid of the 273 D-5's we do, or soon will, have. It is a fine missile. We just do not need to spend billions on more. My amendment would save a minimum of \$4 billion and up to \$11 billion in missile production costs alone. The additional \$7 billion would be saved if the Navy finally decided not to backfit the Pacific Fleet and replace the C-4's currently in use.

Mr. Chairman, the cold war has been history for over 2 years, our deficit is the highest in the history of this country, and yet we are told we must continue to build 24 D-5's per year at a cost of \$50 million per missile and \$1 billion per year from now until the year 2007.

There are alternatives. According to the Navy, they need a minimum of 109 more D-5 missiles after 1994. Instead of borrowing billions of dollars to do this, I believe it would be better to consider the following:

First, maintain current number of warheads per missile at eight instead of reducing to four as the Navy has planned. We could have the same 96 warheads, but would require 120 fewer D-5's. This would already amount to more than the 109 the Pentagon has requested;

Second, reducing the D-5 flight test rate to the same pace as that used by the Air Force for its strategic missiles, 3 per year, would eliminate the need for 60 missiles, and

Third, any reduction in the overall warhead ceiling of START II down from 3,500 to 2,500 any time in the next 20 years would eliminate the Navy's requirement by up to 125 missiles.

Mr. Chairman, put simply, the production of the D-5 missile should be stopped after fiscal year 1994 because it is possible to maintain our START II ceilings on submarine launched warheads with our current inventory. Any suggestion that we should do nothing in this area because of START II considerations should be seen as a smokescreen to scare people away from taking a closer look at this issue.

The elimination of advanced procurement money from the fiscal year 1994 DOD budget would save a minimum of 120 missiles and a minimum of \$4 billion while retaining the same basic strategic capabilities.

The House Armed Services Committee has already directed the Secretary of Defense to examine other options which would allow us to achieve the submarine-launched ballistic missile warhead levels permitted under START II at significantly reduced cost and to report to the congressional defense committees on these options no later than April 1, 1994. As I have outlined, the Navy has many options to meet our strategic needs.

The Senate Armed Services Committee has added money to their bill to increase long-lead funding for next year which would double D-5 production rates. We as members of this body need to pass this amendment to offset this unwise action.

Mr. Chairman, the cold war is over. The American public knows that 650 nuclear-tipped submarine-launched missiles, backed up by over 200 strategic nuclear bombers and 500 deployed ICBM's are far more than enough to meet our needs for a strategic nuclear deterrence. They also know that in this time of

budgetary constraint more D-5's are not needed for the strategic defense of this country. With the production of 24 missiles in 1994, we will have a sufficient SLBM inventory of C-4/D-5's to meet our needs into the next century.

The adoption of my amendment would stop production of the D-5 after fiscal year 1994 and would save the taxpayers \$4 to 11 billion. America needs to reduce the deficit and not spend billions more on unneeded relics of the cold war.

□ 1110

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). All time on general debate has expired. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part 2 of House Report No. 103-223.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLUMS: Strike out subsection (a) of section 153 (page 31, line 22, through page 32, line 5) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(a) TERMINATION OF PRODUCTION.—None of the amounts appropriated pursuant to section 102 for procurement of weapons (including missiles and torpedoes) for the Navy for fiscal year 1994 may be obligated for procurement of Trident II (D-5) missiles or for advance procurement for production of D-5 missiles for a fiscal year after fiscal year 1994.

Strike out subsection (c) of section 153 (page 32, lines 16 through 24).

At the end of subtitle E of title I (page 33, after line 6), insert the following new section:

SEC. 155. REALLOCATION OF FUNDS.

(a) REDUCTION IN FUNDS FOR D-5 MISSILE.—The amount provided in section 102(a)(2) is hereby reduced by \$1,128,551,000, to be derived from the Trident II (D-5) missile program.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, to begin the debate on the Dellums amendment, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself in an awkward position today, in fact working against, in some ways, a number of my colleagues I have worked with in the past, including the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN]. The gentleman from Utah and I were just involved in a move several months ago to terminate the ASRM rocket system because NASA had changed the definition of its mission for the space station, and we made the case it was no longer necessary because the mission was changed.

Well, I think that is the same situation we find ourselves in today. The D-5 was planned during the cold war in

order to penetrate hardened targets such as missile silos found only in the Soviet Union. As we know today, the Soviet Union is not the threat it was just several years ago.

Again, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] made the case that instead of facing one monster in the world, we now face hundreds of snakes all over the world. Well, let me make the second point. That with nearly 400 C-4 and 300 D-5 submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and 3,500 nuclear warheads, I would suggest we have enough fire power to kill thousands of snakes, if necessary.

The D-5 was designed to carry a larger warhead than its predecessor, the C-4, was able to support. Again, we have a changing mission. The larger warheads have been limited, and the D-5's today are carrying the same warheads as the C-4.

Finally, the bottom line—it may cost \$350 million to retrofit, as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] said. It will cost \$1.2 billion to finish the project, and \$10 billion to 1999. Three hundred fifty million dollars is a very good financial figure.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTELEY].

Mr. MACHTELEY. Mr. Chairman, I must rise in opposition to my distinguished chairman's amendment to terminate the D-5 missile. This is more than just an economic consideration. It is an international arms control strategic decision that we are about to make today.

The START treaty, as supported by the President of the United States, President Clinton, was predicated upon having D-5 missiles. Were the D-5 missile program to stop today, the entire START treaty very likely would have to be renegotiated.

But it is more than just a missile. It is an economic consideration as well, as my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has discussed on this floor. It will actually cost us more money to reconfigure the 10 Trident submarines which are currently under construction to carry a C-4 missile or to do something else than it will to save the expected \$1.2 billion which is in this current budget.

I ask my colleagues to support the President of the United States. He understands, although we must cut defense dollars, that we must also make sure that we are not ruining our strategic arms agreements, which have been very delicately discussed, negotiated, and agreed to.

There is no question that the START treaty will be in severe jeopardy were this amendment to pass. For this reason, because I believe that the economic realities of the cuts are going to not be realized, I would ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this

amendment. I think it is important that we understand the facts and the strategic implications.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACHTLEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to compliment the gentleman on his statement. The arms control implications of this are very serious. We have in essence protected D-5 and Trident in our START I and START II agreements. What we would really do here is undermine the entire negotiations between the United States and the former Soviet Union at a time when this is still under great doubt about just how this is going to come out, because of the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, first let me just respond to my colleagues on this arms control issue. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I think this is a scare tactic. If my colleagues will recall, historically the Russians tried to get us to stop producing the D-5 a long time ago.

The cold war is over. To talk about fighting nuclear war is madness. It is extraordinary, it is extreme.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] pointed out, this weapons system was designed to hit hard targets. As the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ] pointed out, the Soviet Union has exploded on its own.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members that the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] does have the right to close debate.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let us put this in proper perspective. I appreciate my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], and his fine comments. I would point out that the C-4 and D-5 are different missiles, one very accurate, and one not too accurate. The C-4 is not intended to be the permanent missile. It probably does not have quite the firepower that we are referring to.

Let us get this thing in proper perspective if we may. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs made the following statement. This is a very important man and a very good man. He is not a Republican or a Democrat, as far as any of us know. And this is what he said:

The D-5 missile on Trident submarines will be the backbone—the backbone—of the U.S. strategic deterrent forces under START II. I do not support the proposal of renegotiating

the terms of the START II treaty with Russia to allow either country to decrease the number of missiles carried by a submarine. I believe that production of the D-5 should not be prematurely terminated. The vast majority of the Trident investment is behind us, and procuring the remaining missiles for the Atlantic Ocean Trident submarines will ensure a credible deterrent well into the twenty-first century.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, is it not also true that Les Aspin, the Secretary of Defense, strongly opposes this amendment?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, that is absolutely correct. I also have his quote, and I will not bore Members with it. Basically it is the same thing as what the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs said.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it also not true that Bill Clinton, the President of the United States, has written the Congress, written every Member up here, urging them not to end the D-5 program?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would also respond to that that we have a letter here in our package from the President of the United States urging us not to stop the D-5 program. Yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, does it not make sense in this context then to continue D-5? We are eliminating, as the gentleman mentioned and I mentioned, almost every other strategic nuclear program. So we have heard the plea of we do not need these systems, we do not need to worry about nuclear war fighting. There is one system left that is still unfinished, that is the most survivable part of the triad. Is that not correct?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman. I think the gentleman made the point in his earlier remarks that we have given up on the bombers and our land-based missiles. We have one thing left in the basket, and that is the D-5. We should have the very best, and that is the D-5.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the point, to amplify what the gentleman said and to follow up what I said, that the cost of simply sticking the old C-4 in the tubes of the D-5 is substantial, and it really wipes out all the apparent savings that are touted for this solution. Per submarine, the cost is \$350 million.

Then this D-5 missile has a flight control, navigation and guidance system that is state of the art. The C-4 has an older system that is much less efficient. You have got to strip it out and substitute that.

□ 1120

Then we have got to go to Kings Bay, GA, which was built to accommodate only the D-5 missile, and make \$300 million of military construction improvements. And finally, for this additional cost, we get an older, less reliable, less accurate missile which has a service life remaining of 10 years. We are going to put a 10-year service life missile in a submarine that has a whole life of 20, 30, 40 years. It does not make sense.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). All time has expired in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PENNY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, let me say that survivability is rhetoric of the cold war, and the cold war is over.

I might say, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] pointed out, we have enough missiles to destroy all life on this planet. To go forward is bizarre. We can save billions of dollars.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge Members to vote in favor of the Dellums amendment to terminate the D-5 missile. Americans are clearly demanding that Congress cut spending. We should respond by cutting weapons that are no longer needed.

The Trident II submarines and the Trident I submarines are currently deployed by the Navy, and this D-5 missile is designed to go into the tubes of those submarines. The D-5 missile was planned as a replacement for the C-4, and it is specifically designed to hit the hard targets found only in the Soviet Union.

This amendment reduces the amount provided in the bill for procurement for the D-5 missile. It would save a total of \$1.2 billion in fiscal year 1994, over \$10 billion in the next several years, another \$5 billion will be saved if we do not have to retube the old Trident I submarines.

This amendment does not prevent the Department of Defense from deploying the 18 Trident submarines by the turn of the century. It does not prevent the Department of Defense from deploying the maximum number of nuclear warheads allowed under the START II treaty so long as we get an addendum or an amendment to that treaty speaking to this tubing issue. But even without an agreement with the Russians on this issue, we can reduce the number of D-5 missiles on each of the Trident submarines, and we would end up no worse than parity with the Soviet Union in terms of the number of warheads, 3,000 warheads.

In sum, what this amendment does is end the procurement of D-5 after 1993, and it requires the Department of Defense to maintain our sea-based leg

with a lower cost to American taxpayers. Instead of a total of 628 D-5 missiles, we will still have 295; enough to deploy on the Trident II submarines, as well as to carry out an adequate testing and evaluation program.

I urge support for this amendment, which has been endorsed by the National Taxpayers Union, the Federation of American Scientists and other groups. The choice today is simple. We can vote to save billions of dollars, or we can vote to waste billions of dollars.

American voters want Congress to use some common sense. We cannot cut the deficit unless we cut spending.

Vote for the Dellums amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would terminate production of the D-5—Trident II—missile in fiscal year 1994. Half the \$1.128 billion in funds would be used for deficit reduction and half would be transferred to Defense conversion, intended for use with the technology reinvestment package.

Halting this program now will save at least \$5 billion in program costs and perhaps as much as \$19 billion, if we include the cost of backfitting the first eight Trident submarines with D-5 missiles, which the Navy wants to do. All this money will be borrowed, so we will be paying interest on this money as well. Over the next 30 years, this interest cost would add an extra \$50 to \$60 billion to the tab. We can't afford this waste.

Last year the Bush administration gave serious consideration to the option of offloading missiles from submarines to meet our lower START II warhead requirements. Secretary Cheney testified before Congress to this. DOD finally made up its mind without taking fiscal considerations into account.

So let us not be stampeded into thinking that this is an unrealistic option and would hurt the START process. It will help save us billions. I urge your support for this amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] that would terminate production of the Trident II missile.

The world security environment has undergone revolutionary change over the last 5 years. The Soviet Union is no more. The nations of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union are undergoing the challenging task of converting from failed state socialism to market economies and democratic political institutions. The United States and our Western Allies are committed to assisting these efforts that will hopefully result in a stable, peaceful world environment.

But we have not reached the point where we can be certain that the world will live happily ever after. Just as no one could have predicted the events of the last few years, no one can say for certain where the world will be by the year 2000. As noted in Secretary Aspin's bottom-up review, "tens of thousands of nuclear weapons continue to be deployed on Russian territory, and on the territory of three other former Soviet Republics." The political future of these Republics, including Russia, and whether they will continue to cooperate with the West, is not cast in stone.

Nuclear proliferation is an increasing threat. North Korea may be closer to developing the

capability to produce nuclear weapons, and deliver them against their neighbors, than we have predicted in the past. India and Pakistan have the potential to develop into a dangerous point of nuclear confrontation. Terrorist states such as Iraq, Iran, and Libya also have dangerous potential. The bottom line is that it is far too early to conclude that we can forgo our nuclear deterrent forces entirely.

The fact remains that the United States has removed 80 percent of the START I required reductions in the number of warheads on ballistic missile systems, where as the former Soviet Union has only removed 15 percent of the same type.

The Russians are currently developing, and plan to deploy three new ballistic missiles within the next 10 years: a road mobile, single RV, as well as a silo-based single RV, and a follow-on missile for the Typhoon class ballistic missile submarine. These deployments occur despite its country's severe economic problems.

Russia is still facing controversy in attempting to achieve complete control over all of the 30,000 tactical and strategic nuclear warheads within the former Soviet Union. The Ukrainian and Russian Governments still must ratify their President's recommendations to bring these weapons under Russian control. Under the very best circumstances, it would take longer than 10 years to destroy these levels of stockpiles.

Nonetheless, the changed environment allows us to make dramatic reductions in these forces. Consider the cuts we have already made, or plan to make to comply with START II ceilings. The Peacekeeper, small ICBM and Minuteman II ICBM's are eliminated. All 500 Minuteman III missiles will be downgraded to a single warhead. We are buying only 15 percent of the B-2 bombers originally programmed, the SRAM II Program has been canceled and cruise missile carrying B-52's retired. All but three of the Poseidon submarines have already been scrapped and the remaining ones soon will be. The Trident submarine program has been capped at 18 and the W-88 warhead terminated.

As a result, the Trident submarine force will be even more critical as the lowest cost and the most survivable leg of the strategic deterrent. In addition, the D-5 is the only strategic missile still under production.

The assertion that the Navy already has enough D-5 missiles for deployment is incorrect. The fiscal years 1994 through 1999 production quantities requested by the Department of Defense are needed to support the inventory objective of 428 D-5 missiles.

This inventory is based on the commitment of 10 D-5 capable subs, 24 missiles per sub on patrol, flight test programs based on demonstrated reliability, the START I and START II Agreements and the planned strategic force structure. And as President Clinton has stated:

Even at the lowest Trident levels that remain under review pursuant to the bottom-up review, additional D-5 missile procurements are required in fiscal years 1994 and 1995.

There are many who are offering statements suggesting we just detube the submarines. Deploying with empty tubes is not the answer in terms of the START Agreements, given the

fact that it is the tubes and the launchers that are counted. The President clearly stated the problems when he said:

A U.S. proposal along these lines would open a Pandora's box in terms of inviting counterproposals by our START partners for relief from other treaty dismantlement requirements they find onerous. If the United States were to ask Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan for permission to revise or eliminate the strict START SLBM launcher elimination procedures, each of these states would likely demand a quid pro quo in areas under both START and CFE where they are already pressing us to simplify or waive weapons elimination requirements. The result would be an unraveling of the meticulously negotiated dismantlement procedures contained in both accords, with an attendant degradation in the irreversibility of these agreements.

It is no secret that the many Russians still believe that the terms in the START II Treaty are overly favorable to the United States, especially ICBM silo elimination procedures.

Reopening START I would no doubt cause the very unraveling of this long negotiated dismantlement treaty. I do not believe this Congress wants such a responsibility.

The Trident submarine force will constitute half of the U.S. strategic deterrence in the 21st century, and will provide the flexibility and reliability in U.S. strategic forces.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues not to support the Dellums amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired for debate on amendment No. 1 printed in part 2 of House Report 103-223, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] relating to the Trident II D-5 missile.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 240, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 415]

AYES—183

Abercrombie	Collins (MI)	Fingerhut
Allard	Condit	Flake
Andrews (ME)	Coppersmith	Ford (MI)
Applegate	Coyne	Ford (TN)
Ballenger	Crane	Frank (MA)
Barca	Danner	Furse
Barlow	de Lugo (VI)	Gephardt
Barrett (WI)	DeFazio	Gibbons
Becerra	DeLauro	Glickrest
Bellenson	Dellums	Glickman
Berman	Dooley	Goodlatte
Blackwell	Duncan	Gordon
Bonior	Durbin	Grandy
Boucher	Edwards (CA)	Green
Brown (CA)	English (AZ)	Gutierrez
Brown (OH)	Eshoo	Hall (OH)
Bryant	Evans	Hamburg
Byrne	Everett	Hastings
Cardin	Faleomavaega	Hilliard
Carr	(AS)	Hinchey
Clay	Farr	Hobson
Clayton	Fields (LA)	Hoekstra
Collins (IL)	Filner	Holden

Hughes
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Klink
Klug
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Margolies-
Mezvinsky
Markey
McCloskey
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McKinney
Meehan
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley

Moran
Morella
Murphy
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reynolds
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Romero-Barcelo
(PR)
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Santorum
Schaefer

Schenk
Schroeder
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Snowe
Stark
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Thompson
Thurman
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—240

Ackerman
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Arney
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Billbray
Billakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Borski
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Castle
Chapman
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crapo
Cunningham
Darden
de la Garza

Deal
DeLay
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (OK)
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gillmor
Gillman
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington

Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klecicka
Klein
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Machtley
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McCreery
McCurdy
McDade
McHugh
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Mineta

Mollinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ravenel
Regula
Richardson

Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rowland
Sarpallius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schiff
Schumer
Shaw
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skeltion
Slattery
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Spratt

NOT VOTING—15

Archer
Brown (FL)
Conyers
Dingell
Engel

Foglietta
Hoke
Hyde
Neal (NC)
Price (NC)

Reed
Stokes
Valentine
Vucanovich
Young (AK)

□ 1145

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Stokes for, with Mrs. Vucanovich against.

Mr. KASICH changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. ROYCE, SCHAEFER, BLACKWELL, SWIFT, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part 2 of House Report 103-223.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ABERCROMBIE

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERCROMBIE: In section 153(a)(2), strike out "not more than \$145,251,000 may be obligated for advance procurement" (page 32, beginning on line 3) and insert in lieu thereof "no amount may be obligated for advance procurement". At the end of section 153 (page 32, after line 24), insert the following:

(d) MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES.—Of the funds appropriated to the Navy for fiscal year 1994, not more than \$50,000,000 may be obligated for industrial facilities for production of Trident II (D-5) missiles.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, having defeated the previous amendment, this Congress has now made the commitment to spend another \$1 billion on the D-5 missile in fiscal year 1994. But at the very least we ought to be willing to say that that is the end of it.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] and cosponsored by myself, would cancel this weapon system beginning in fiscal year 1995. It would slice out the \$200 million in development funds for those additional weapons in this year's budget. We at least ought to be able to do that.

□ 1150

We ought to be able to knock out the advanced procurement money which commits us to even more D-5 missiles into the future. The Abercrombie amendment gives us 1 year to kick the cold war addiction. This weapons system is a tremendous expense at a time when the country cannot afford it. This weapons system should be canceled and at the very least we ought to be willing to cancel it starting in fiscal 1995.

Vote for the Abercrombie-Penny amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is another way to kill the D-5. If you voted "no" on the last amendment, you want to vote "no" on this one. I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS]. Let me first say that we have made a lot of down selections in our strategic assets. The D-5 is the consensus centerpiece of our strategic deterrent. That is a consensus that has been reached on the conservative side, on the liberal side; it is a consensus that exists in the Department of Defense and has been agreed to by the President of the United States. It is the right way to go.

If you voted "no" last time, vote "no" this time.

Let me yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to my colleagues who say, "Why do we need nuclear weapons?" Let me tell you what the systems we have already cancelled are: We have stopped the Peacekeeper, we have stopped the small ICBM, we are building 15 percent of the B-5's that we intended to build; we stopped the SRAM II; we have eliminated the W-88 warhead. This is

the only remaining system we have got. If we kill it, we undermine our entire position in the arms control agreement in START-I and START-II. It is opposed by the President of the United States, Bill Clinton; it is opposed by Les Aspin, former chairman of this committee and now our Secretary of Defense; Colin Powell, our most distinguished military leader and chairman of the Joint Chiefs, they are adamantly opposed to stopping this program because of what it does to us both strategically and also what it does to our arms control regime.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] points out very effectively that we are only halfway through this program. And if we do not go ahead, then we are going to have to go back and put C-4's on submarines that were built for the D-5. This amendment makes no sense. We ought to, as the gentleman pointed out, we ought to stay with our previous position and support the committee position.

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman is absolutely right. This would destabilize the arms control agreement that we put in place. Beyond that, we have North Korea looming on the horizon with potential hard targets.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, may I confirm the fact that this side has the right to close? Am I correct in that?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, with that in mind, I would yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. INSLEE].

Mr. INSLEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to share with my colleagues two facts that I learned when I studied the D-5 missile.

Fact No. 1: We have the ability to bounce to rubble today and tomorrow and for the next 30 years the Soviet Union and its former colonies with the C-4 missiles. The C-4 missile, according to a study conducted by the Department of Defense, concluded that the C-4 missile, which can bounce to rubble already, is good to the year 2016, 2016.

Let me tell you what we can already do with our capability today. Let me tell you what I found out. Today we have a study showing that with 140 equivalent megatons we can kill 158 million citizens of the former Soviet Union, kill 45 percent of the Soviet Union. Colleagues, guess how many equivalent megatons we will have under SALT-II. With 140 equivalent megatons, we can kill half the Soviet Union, then how many do you think we are going to have without the D-5? We are going to have 1,370.

We do not need a missile to do hardened targets. Nothing is hardened in the Soviet Union. The only thing that is hardened is our Federal deficit.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining 3 minutes of our time to my colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, let me restate and emphasize what my colleague from California [Mr. HUNTER] just said: If you voted against the last amendment, you should vote against this amendment because both kill the D-5 missile before it is even begun to get close to the Navy's requirement. This amendment would kill the D-5 somewhere in the range of 250 to 260 missiles. The Navy needs 428 D-5 missiles just to accommodate, just to outfit the Trident, 10 Trident submarine boats that have been built around this particular missile system, designed, custom-built for the D-5. It will stop the D-5 program, but it will not stop the spending, which is what I have been trying to emphasize out here in the debate today. The savings that are touted here are more illusory than real. Indeed, I do not even think they exist.

It has been claimed we will save \$10 billion. The whole up-cost to complete the procurement of the D-5 is just over \$4 billion. Furthermore, if we do what Mr. INSLEE said and go to the C-4 as a substitute, the spending starts up. We need \$350 million per boat to take the tubes and build the tubes so that they will accommodate the C-4 missile instead of the D-5 missile. That is \$1.75 billion for 5 submarine boats. We need \$340 million still for spares. If you do not have a production line to support the cost of the spare production, it is going to cost more than that.

We will need \$300 million to go to Kings Bay, GA, where the Trident II's are based, and accommodate the facility to handle the C-4's. So we do not save any money. Furthermore, we have bought a missile that has a remaining life of 10 to 15 years, we put it on a submarine which has a hull life of 30 years, specified, with a hull life probably of 40 years. So before the life of the Trident II submarine has exhausted its hull life, this missile will be spent. We will have to replace it, we will have to service it to extend its life. That will cost another \$3 billion to \$4 billion. There are no savings here. It is clearly a compromise.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman is a real expert in this area.

I just want to say that one of the few things we still do in foreign policy that is bipartisan is arms control and that

we have built our arms control regime, which is very complicated, around the D-5 missile. We now have 4 former Soviet states with nuclear systems. We have a very complicated arms control regime that has been transferred successfully, I think, to the Clinton administration.

If you believe in a bipartisan, stable arms control regime, vote for D-5. I thank the gentleman for his expertise.

Mr. SPRATT. The bottom line, Mr. Chairman, is there is no savings represented by this amendment. If you voted against the Dellums amendment, you should also vote against the Abercrombie amendment and you should understand that they will not save anything and they will give us a less effective, less reliable, less efficient missile system in return for the D-5 missile, which is under production now.

□ 1200

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he might consume to the distinguished committee chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Just briefly, Mr. Chairman, let me point out in response to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], No. 1, the Navy understands and the Navy has reported that the C-4 missile is lasting a lot longer than they thought. If you do not add the guidance system to the C-4 missile, it does save you a significant amount of money. If you buy all the other arguments, the gentleman from South Carolina is correct. I do not buy all the arguments. They do not need a new guidance system on the C-4 and the dollars that we talked about are real savings.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, 183 people voted for the Dellums amendment the last time, which does not end any systems, which does not inhibit the capacity of the United States to defend itself in one single instance. Anybody who is bringing up on this floor that somehow we are ending our nuclear deterrence is not telling the truth.

The truth is that we are either going to make an effort on deficit spending or we are not going to do it. This is the way to do it.

This is the biggest pork barrel there is. This is missile bulimia. We are vomiting missiles up. We cannot consume all the missiles that are here.

Every single one of these is like a sorcerer coming in, sweeping out of the castle, one after another, never ending.

This is the opportunity for 35 Members, we are looking for 35 Members to look into their conscience and say enough is enough.

The people who want us to keep going with these missiles, the continuation of the building of these missiles, are the hard-line Communists who

want to bring down Yeltsin in Russia, who use our continued missile building in this area, the D-5, as an example of why the United States is getting ready to wipe out Russia.

They are just as cynical as the people who want to go forward here when we have more than enough. This is our opportunity. Thirty-five Members, that is what we are looking for to stand up and take a stand today for fiscal sanity in the defense budget.

We are not moving to the domestic side. This gives us the opportunity to build housing for our military people, to see to it that they get an adequate pay raise, to see that they have the kind of weapons that they need today.

Many of you have taken trips over the break, you know what our military needs. This is low priority with the Navy.

This is the area and this is the time for us to step forward and make our vote.

Thirty-five Democrats and Republicans and Independents here, 35 people to take a stand for fiscal sanity in defense.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, all time has expired for consideration of Amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 103-223.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 240, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 416]

AYES—188

Abercrombie	Dellums	Gutierrez
Ackerman	Deutsch	Hall (OH)
Andrews (ME)	Dingell	Hamburg
Applegate	Dooley	Hastings
Barca	Duncan	Hillard
Barcia	Durbin	Hinchey
Barlow	Edwards (CA)	Hobson
Barrett (WI)	English (AZ)	Hoekstra
Becerra	Eshoo	Holden
Bellenson	Evans	Horn
Berman	Everett	Hughes
Blackwell	Faleomavaega	Inlee
Bonior	(AS)	Jacobs
Boucher	Farr	Jefferson
Brown (CA)	Fields (LA)	Johnson (CT)
Brown (OH)	Filner	Johnston
Bryant	Fingerhut	Kanjorski
Byrne	Flake	Kennedy
Cardin	Foglietta	Kildee
Carr	Ford (MI)	Klink
Clay	Ford (TN)	Klug
Clayton	Frank (MA)	Kopetski
Coble	Furse	Kreidler
Collins (IL)	Gejdenson	LaFalce
Collins (MI)	Gephardt	Lambert
Condit	Gibbons	Leach
Coppersmith	Gichrest	Levin
Coyne	Glickman	Lewis (GA)
Crane	Gonzalez	Long
Danner	Goodlatte	Lowey
de Lugo (VI)	Gordon	Maloney
DeFazio	Grandy	Margolies-
DeLauro	Greenwood	Mezvinsky

Markey	Poshard	Snowe
McCloskey	Rahall	Stark
McDermott	Ramstad	Strickland
McHale	Reed	Studds
McKinney	Reynolds	Stupak
Meehan	Roemer	Swett
Mfume	Rohrabacher	Synar
Miller (CA)	Romero-Barcelo	Thompson
Miller (FL)	(PR)	Thurman
Minge	Rostenkowski	Torres
Mink	Roth	Torricelli
Moakley	Roukema	Towns
Moran	Roybal-Allard	Traffant
Morella	Royce	Tucker
Murphy	Rush	Underwood (GU)
Nadler	Sabo	Unsoeld
Neal (MA)	Sanders	Upton
Norton (DC)	Sangmeister	Velazquez
Nussle	Santorum	Vento
Oberstar	Sawyer	Washington
Obey	Schenck	Waters
Owens	Schroeder	Watt
Pallone	Scott	Waxman
Pastor	Sensenbrenner	Wheat
Payne (NJ)	Serrano	Williams
Pelosi	Sharp	Woolsey
Penny	Shays	Wyden
Peterson (MN)	Skaggs	Wynn
Petri	Slattery	Yates
Pomeroy	Slaughter	Zimmer
Porter	Smith (MI)	

NOES—240

Allard	Dornan	Kyl
Andrews (NJ)	Dreier	Lancaster
Andrews (TX)	Dunn	Lantos
Archer	Edwards (TX)	LaRocco
Armey	Emerson	Laughlin
Bacchus (FL)	English (OK)	Lazio
Bachus (AL)	Ewing	Lehman
Baerles	Fawell	Levy
Baker (CA)	Fazio	Lewis (CA)
Baker (LA)	Fields (TX)	Lewis (FL)
Ballenger	Fish	Lightfoot
Barrett (NE)	Fowler	Linder
Bartlett	Franks (CT)	Lipinski
Barton	Franks (NJ)	Livingston
Bateman	Frost	Lloyd
Bentley	Galleghy	Machtley
Bereuter	Gallo	Mann
Bevill	Gekas	Manton
Bilbray	Geren	Manzullo
Bilirakis	Gillmor	Martinez
Bishop	Gilman	Matsui
Bliley	Gingrich	Mazzoli
Blute	Goodling	McCandless
Boehler	Goss	McCollum
Boehner	Grams	McCrery
Bonilla	Green	McCurdy
Borski	Gunderson	McDade
Brewster	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Brooks	Hamilton	McInnis
Browder	Hancock	McKeon
Bunning	Hansen	McMillan
Burton	Harman	McNulty
Buyer	Hastert	Meek
Callahan	Hayes	Menendez
Calvert	Heffley	Meyers
Camp	Hefner	Mica
Canady	Herger	Michel
Cantwell	Hoagland	Mineta
Castle	Hochbrueckner	Mollinari
Chapman	Houghton	Mollohan
Clement	Hoyer	Montgomery
Clinger	Huffington	Moorhead
Clyburn	Hunter	Murtha
Coleman	Hutchinson	Myers
Collins (GA)	Hutto	Natcher
Combest	Inglis	Olver
Cooper	Inhofe	Ortiz
Costello	Istook	Orton
Cox	Johnson (GA)	Oxley
Cramer	Johnson (SD)	Packard
Crapo	Johnson, E. B.	Parkar
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Paxon
Darden	Kaptur	Payne (VA)
de la Garza	Kasich	Peterson (FL)
Deal	Kennelly	Pickett
DeLay	Kim	Pickle
Derrick	King	Pombo
Diaz-Balart	Kingston	Portman
Dickey	Klecza	Price (NC)
Dicks	Klein	Pryce (OH)
Dixon	Knollenberg	Quillen
Doolittle	Kolbe	Quinn

Ravenel	Skeen	Taylor (NC)
Regula	Skellton	Tejeda
Richardson	Smith (IA)	Thomas (CA)
Ridge	Smith (NJ)	Thomas (WY)
Roberts	Smith (OR)	Thornton
Rogers	Smith (TX)	Torkildsen
Ros-Lehtinen	Solomon	Valentine
Rose	Spence	Visclosky
Rowland	Spratt	Volkmer
Sarpallus	Stearns	Walker
Saxton	Stenholm	Walsh
Schaefer	Stump	Weldon
Schiff	Sundquist	Whitten
Schumer	Swift	Wilson
Shaw	Talent	Wise
Shepherd	Tanner	Wolf
Shuster	Tauzin	Young (FL)
Sisisky	Taylor (MS)	Zeliff

NOT VOTING—10

Brown (FL)	Hyde	Vucanovich
Conyers	Neal (NC)	Young (AK)
Engel	Rangel	
Hoke	Stokes	

□ 1221

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Stokes for, with Mrs. Vucanovich against.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, because I was unfortunately delayed at Bethesda Naval Hospital today, I missed two recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on rollcall votes No. 415 and No. 416.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part 2 of House Report 103-223.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

Amendment offered by Mr. DICKS: Strike out subsection (c) of section 153 (page 32, lines 16 through 24).

Strike out section 154 (page 33, lines 1 through 6) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 154. STUDY OF TRIDENT MISSILE SUBMARINE PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than April 1, 1994, a report comparing (1) modifying Trident I submarines to enable those submarines to be deployed with D-5 missiles, with (2) retaining the Trident I (C-4) missile on the Trident I submarine. In preparing the report, the Secretary shall include considerations of cost effectiveness, force structure requirements, and future strategic flexibility of the Trident I and Trident II submarine programs.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume,

and I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. CANTWELL].

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Dicks amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in this era of massive Federal deficits, we must carefully scrutinize how we spend and save scarce defense resources. It is imperative that the money we do spend is spent wisely. In view to terminate Trident II—or the D-5—missile premature.

The Pentagon is continuing its investigation into the appropriate size and composition of our strategic forces for the post-cold-war world, as part of its comprehensive bottom-up review of defense programs, military strategy, and force structure. While we know some of the results of this review, DOD has yet to come out with its analysis on the D-5.

A number of objective studies—including a recent GAO report which states, “the sea leg—the Trident II—emerges as the most cost effective, taking into account all the measures of effectiveness * * *”—clearly suggest that we must carefully consider our actions.

Canceling production of this missile today will preempt the decisions to be made in the very near future concerning its role in the future security of our Nation.

While our DOD military and civilian leadership continue to debate this extremely complex and multi-faceted issue, we must restrain ourselves from taking irreversible and potentially irresponsible actions limiting our strategic force structure alternatives.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is clearly such an action and should be rejected.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this is the Dicks amendment that would require a study of the D-5 by April 1.

Mr. DICKS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, based upon that and the reality that we do need this information, based on this information, I think this body can make a rational and intelligent decision with respect to the future of the D-5. In that regard, I am prepared on this side of the aisle to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the kindness and courtesy of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, we have considered that amendment on our side, and we have no objection to it. We are in favor of it, and we would vote for its adoption.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to modify language included in H.R. 2401 regarding the Trident II Missile Program.

The bill before the House provides requested funding for this program, but restricts the obligation of these funds that undercut the effective execution of the program and could increase the burden on the taxpayers by millions of dollars. My amendment prevents a D-5 production shutdown while the Defense Department prepares a report on the long-range future of the program, and it deletes the legislation that prohibits Trident I submarines from ever being modernized with the D-5 missile.

Ballistic missile submarines have always provided our most survivable element of the nuclear triad. Under the START II Treaty, more than half of the Nation's warheads will be deployed on submarine-launched ballistic missiles. This amendment recognizes the reliance we will place on the Trident Program to maintain the highest degree of confidence in the future credibility of our strategic deterrent.

I believe that the committee did not fully appreciate the implications of the language it included restricting obligation of these funds, until a report is provided by the Secretary of Defense on how the Department intends to structure the Trident missile forces under the START II ceilings.

I wholeheartedly agree that such a study needs to be conducted, and my amendment retains the requirement that it be undertaken. In fact the Department is already in the process of making this evaluation. Secretary of Defense Aspin noted in his presentation last week on the bottom review that strategic forces will now become an area of particular focus.

But all viable options under consideration by the Department will require procurement of the missiles authorized in this bill. President Clinton stated this clearly in an August 2 letter, “even at the lowest Trident levels that remain under review pursuant to the bottom up review, additional D-5 missile procurements are required in fiscal year 1994 and 1995.” This is not a case of waiting to see if these funds are going to be wasted. President Clinton, Secretary Aspin and Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Colin Powell have all expressed their unreserved judgment that we need to go forward with the program at least to the point that the funds in this bill provide.

Waiting over 4 months to obligate any of the fiscal year 1994 Trident missile procurement funds will clearly result in a production gap. Secretary of Navy John Dalton stated in a letter to Chairman DELLUMS:

Since production of the 24 D-5 missiles requested in fiscal year 1994 is required to support the ten new construction D-5 configured SSBN's under any Start II Treaty scenarios, delayed obligation authority needlessly increases program cost by breaking numerous prime and subvendor production lines, which would necessitate costly requalification efforts. Contractors would be forced to lay off production workers, some sub-tier suppliers would likely drop out of the program and the technical risk involved in producing reliable D-5 missiles would be greatly increased.

This is a cost saving amendment.

My amendment also deletes the language that prohibits retrofitting Trident I submarines to carry D-5 missiles. My amendment recommends that the Secretary of Defense conduct a study comparing the options of D-5 missile backfit with keeping the C-4 missile on

the Trident I submarine. The study will also consider cost effectiveness, force structure requirements, and future strategic flexibility.

Secretary Dalton states:

As to the issue of backfitting the eight Pacific based Trident SSBN's to D-5 capability, the prohibition proposed in the HASC Report restricts the Department before it explores options to determine the most cost effective SLBM force structure in the broad context of all U.S. strategic forces. This provision amounts to a unilateral reduction in U.S. capability, outside the context of arms control initiatives, prior to the coordinated Department wide nuclear force posture review which is anticipated to begin in late 1993.

A decision on this issue does not have to be made until fiscal year 1996. Initial analysis indicates that it may well be less costly over the life of the program to retrofit Trident I equipped submarines rather than try to extend the service life of their missiles. My amendment gives the Secretary the flexibility he needs to conduct his thorough review for the future of the U.S. strategic forces, including the future of the Trident SSBN, and prevents any option from being precluded in the future Trident submarine force.

I urge your support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

The amendment was agreed to.

BURDENSARING

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to debate the subject matter of burdensaring.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD] will be recognized for 10 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD].

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is long past time for this body to place the burdensaring debate where it belongs—solidly on the grounds of securing our own national interests. Every Member of this body should certainly understand that we do not have troops in Japan, Korea, or Europe primarily to defend those countries. We have judged that vital U.S. national interests are at stake overseas and that forward military presence is vital to securing those interests. The United States must be willing to bear the responsibilities and burdens associated with securing its interests and should insist that its allies share those responsibilities to the extent that their interests are also being secured.

The Lloyd/Sisisky amendment recognizes the importance of forward military presence to securing U.S. national interests and would provide adequate support for maintaining that presence. It also recognizes that such forward presence costs us far less in the long

run—it helps us pursue our own national security interests on a collective basis rather than pursuing them on a costly unilateral basis.

Let's take a look at the progress we are making as a result of the mandates passed in last year's authorization bill. First, as a result of the amendment offered last year by Mrs. SCHROEDER, we are withdrawing our troops from Europe so as to have no more than 100,000 there by 1996. Also by 1996 Mr. Gephardt's amendment from last year is reducing our total overseas forces to 60 percent of the 1992 level. The amendments of Mr. FRANK and Mr. KASICH resulted in the reduction of \$500 million in U.S. overseas military spending. The amendment we are offering here would provide a capstone to these congressional actions with the net result of cutting \$3.3 billion from last year's figures.

Mr. Chairman, our allies have also taken significant steps in the direction of more equitably sharing the responsibilities and burdens associated with mutual security and stability. Japan, for example, currently contributes roughly \$3 billion per year against United States stationing costs and has agreed to pay virtually all such costs by 1995 except those, such as salaries, that would not be appropriate. South Korea currently contributes roughly \$2 billion per year against United States stationing costs, and has agreed to pay substantially more by 1995. Germany hosts the largest concentration of United States forces overseas, provides by far the greatest reductions and offsets of United States stationing costs, and contributes far more than any other country to the reconstruction, democratization and economic reform of Eastern Europe.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am co-sponsoring today takes into account this significant progress we have made in reducing the U.S. costs of maintaining the forward military presence we need to secure our own national interests. The Lloyd/Sisisky amendment takes the careful and prudent approach to sound and workable burdensharing.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as the ranking member on the NATO panel of the Committee on Armed Services, I want to applaud our chairperson for the job she has done on the issue of burdensharing.

As a Member who has supported burdensharing initiatives in the past and in the last session by our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], and our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], I am well aware of the need to have our allies share more of the responsibility financially

for our commitment both in Europe and around the world. However, I think some of the amendments that are going to be offered need to be looked at very closely by our colleagues.

Those of us on the Republican side could play a partisan game here. We could take some of the amendments that are going to be offered, namely, the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] and the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], and we could support them and we could force this administration into what they describe as an impossible situation. But to do that, we think, would be not just unrealistic, but we think it would not be responsible, and, therefore, many of us will oppose the amendments, not because we want to embarrass the President; we want to work with him on foreign policy.

I would submit, Mr. Chairman, a letter that was sent to our chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] from both Les Aspin, our Secretary of Defense, and Warren Christopher, our Secretary of State. In the letter they state in no uncertain terms that these amendments would jeopardize our vital national interests.

□ 1230

We will get into these in the amendments. But specifically they say that the proposed amendments run contrary to U.S. interests and would pretend disastrous consequences, certainly a diminution of American prestige and leadership.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a Republican saying this. This is the Clinton administration. But we are going to do the responsible thing over here. We are going to work to oppose these amendments and support our President, and work to support our Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense, working to provide a responsible foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would suggest those who want to cut \$1 billion out of our defense budget should be offering an amendment to bring our troops home from Somalia. We could save \$1.5 billion, because that is what it is costing us. But I do not see any of my colleagues who voted to keep our troops in Somalia for unlimited time periods standing up saying to bring our troops home now, let us save the \$1.5 billion we are spending on the Somalia operation.

Mr. Chairman, during this debate I think we have to look closely at these amendments. I am going to be supporting the amendment offered by my colleague and the chairperson of our task forces, and I applaud her for her efforts, along with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY]. I would ask our colleagues to work with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD] in

a joint effort to bring about real burdensharing in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, for the record I include the letter from the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense referred to earlier.

SEPTEMBER 7, 1993.

Hon. NORMAN SISISKY,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, House Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: When the Defense Authorization bills reach the floor, amendments will be considered requiring increased allied burdensharing, which would jeopardize our country's ability to sustain its strategic interests abroad.

These proposed amendments would generally reduce force structures, require higher percentages of allied contributions, or reduce anticipated Operations and Maintenance budgets.

It is our assessment, after substantial, very directed and detailed discussions with the Europeans that our burdensharing negotiations with major European allies will not conceivably yield the contributions called for by these proposals. As a result, if enacted into law, these amendments would force the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe, and with them would go our leadership position in European affairs, and our ability to promote and protect our vital interests there.

The President has re-affirmed the United States commitments to NATO, Japan and Korea to maintain our forward military presence. The President made these commitments largely because they represent our own vital strategic interests. The post Cold War period has brought new dangers and instability that threaten our fundamental interests.

Our allied security arrangements with the U.S. forward-deployed presence are the underpinning of our larger vital interests in the world. They contribute immeasurably to world peace; the expansion of democracy and human rights; access to open markets and economic growth opportunities; long-term stability; and democratic consolidation across the region, especially in Eastern Europe, Russia and the newly-independent states of the former Soviet Union.

We share the Congress' concern about equitable burdensharing, and this remains a primary Administration policy. However, the proposed amendments run contrary to U.S. interests and would portend disastrous consequences, certainly a diminution of American prestige and leadership, U.S. European presence, and regional and world influence. What the United States has achieved in Europe over the past half century would be in jeopardy.

We will continue to negotiate vigorously arrangements with our allies that seek to be more beneficial to the United States. The Administration pledges to do its utmost to achieve the lowest possible stationing costs through determined negotiations with our allies, in return for a reasonable level of funding for an adequate forward-deployed force that is ready and capable of carrying out U.S. and collective missions.

But more importantly, the Clinton Administration intends to undertake with our NATO allies a wide-ranging review of our mutual commitments to trans-Atlantic and European regional security through an enlarged concept of security responsibility sharing. The objective is to take us beyond the old, sterile approaches of the Cold War, and seek new understandings with our allies

in the areas of defense planning; resource management; cost sharing and policy management, including sharing new roles and missions involving the emerging democracies of central and eastern Europe, peace-keeping, conflict prevention, and humanitarian relief, among others.

NATO remains the key to stability in Europe. U.S. leadership is vital to the Alliance's future, and we can continue to lead only as long as we maintain the readiness of our forward-deployed forces. We will keep you and the other members of Congress fully apprised on our progress in achieving the goals and objectives of our new strategy. We need Congress as a partner in this endeavor.

WARREN CHRISTOPHER,

Secretary of State.

LES ASPIN,

Secretary of Defense.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, let me say I think burden sharing is one of the most important things we can do. I have never enjoyed really carrying a lot of the water on this, because anywhere you go, people want to treat you like you are the skunk at the garden party. But had some of us not been out there talking about this for a long time, believe me, we would not have made the progress we made in Japan and other places. Because, while it is hard to close bases at home because of Congress, it is very hard to close bases overseas because of the State Department. They have always got a treaty somewhere, and it would not be nice, and you should not do this. They are a better defender of overseas bases and them not having to pay than we are of our own bases in our own districts.

So I am going to try and say what this Congress said in 1991, and this Congress said it by a vote of 412 to 14, and that was when we look at our bases, we ought to look at all our bases in the base closure system, foreign and domestic.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is only fair. Because while they can close them without us, they cannot close them without the State Department, and they protect them.

Mr. Chairman, I just got a letter from one of our European allies, and I will not mention who, but saying how terribly unfair it is that we are thinking about closing the Bermuda base, because that runs their international airport which sustains tourism.

Mr. Chairman, do our constituents want us to know that in the Defense Department we are keeping open foreign airports that sustain tourism? There was not one word of national defense. They cited that the State Department said we should not do this because of treaties signed in 1941 and 1948.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to allow that to continue, then fine. But

that is what we are going to say today, that we ought to treat all the bases fairly, as this Congress said originally and then the administration refused to do. But the time has come. Times have changed, and I hope we can make some progress on that.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the distinguished ranking member and leader in the House on defense issues.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my views on the four so-called burdensharing amendments to H.R. 2401 made in order by the rule.

I am strongly opposed to the Bryant amendment, which requires U.S. allies to pay 100 percent of our overseas costs or else all U.S. troops must be withdrawn. This amendment fails to recognize that the United States maintains forward deployed forces in order to promote democracy, enhance stability, and deter would-be aggressors in regions where the United States has critical economic, political, and security interests. Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Bryant amendment.

I am also strongly opposed to the Frank amendment, which would reduce DOD fiscal year 1994 funds for military activities in Europe by \$1 billion. Deep cuts in the budget for overseas defense activities, as required by the Frank amendment, would result in a considerable loss in the readiness of U.S. forces stationed in Europe and/or deeper reductions in the number of U.S. forces stationed there. As such, the practical effect of this amendment could be to force a return to the "hollow forces" of the 1970's in a region where the United States maintains critical economic, political, and security interests.

I should remind my colleagues that U.S. forces based in Europe are responsible for promoting and defending America's interests across some 82 nations, in an area of responsibility that encompasses not just Europe but also parts of the Near East, North Africa, and sub-Saharan Africa. In the past year alone, these forces have been called upon to perform a wide variety of challenging missions—for example, emergency evacuations of U.S. citizens, humanitarian relief, monitoring and enforcing U.N. resolutions, and providing surveillance of suspected drug traffickers.

My colleagues also should be aware that defense overseas funding has already been cut by approximately 30 percent since fiscal year 1992. It may surprise some of my colleagues to know that, contrary to the grossly inaccurate conventional wisdom, less than 10 percent of the annual U.S. defense budget is actually allocated for overseas defense activities of U.S. troops. In addition, the basing infrastructure in Europe has already been significantly reduced. To date, the

United States has announced the closure or realignment of over 50 percent of the installations we occupied at the start of the drawdown in January 1990.

It is vital that the United States sustain a credible force presence in Europe. As Gen. John Shalikashvili, our next JCS Chairman, has observed:

Our military contribution [to NATO] is significant compared to those of other member nations; so is our influence. Nothing can be more favorable for U.S. interests in Europe than to retain that degree of influence.

Yet the approach recommended by Mr. Frank, if adopted, could result in a dramatic decline in America's ability to influence events in Europe and throughout parts of Africa and Asia. Furthermore, it could result in a regional military force that is increasingly "hollow" and unable to perform the missions it will inevitably be called upon to conduct. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Frank amendment.

Likewise, I oppose the Schroeder amendment, which would require the 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission to include foreign bases along with domestic bases in its closure recommendations and require that at least 25 percent of the bases recommended for closure be overseas facilities.

If enacted, the Schroeder amendment would slow the process of closing or realigning overseas military bases considerably. The United States is reducing overseas bases far more rapidly than here at home. The number of defense sites or installations overseas where operations have ended or been reduced now stands at 840. In light of President Clinton's stated intention to draw down to 100,000 troops in Europe by September 1996, additional overseas base closure announcements will be forthcoming. The DOD plan is to reduce the overseas base structure by approximately 40 percent from cold war levels, consistent with planned reductions in personnel stationed overseas.

In addition, the Schroeder amendment would greatly complicate U.S. foreign policy by involving civilian base closure commissioners in complex treaty and status-of-forces agreement negotiations with foreign nations regarding the residual value of base properties, and so forth. Such an approach is both undesirable, unrealistic, and untenable. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment offered by my colleague, Mrs. SCHROEDER.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I support the Lloyd-Sisisky amendment, which takes into account the progress in burdensharing negotiations with our allies that has occurred over the past several years. Many of these developments were noted in a May 1993 Department of Defense report to Congress entitled, "Allied Contributions to the Common Defense."

Let me briefly remind my colleagues of some of these positive developments. First, Japan currently funds virtually all DOD in-country construction costs and provides, at no charge, land and facilities used by United States forces. These contributions represent roughly \$3 billion a year in direct outlays, forgone receipts, and opportunity costs. In addition, under the cost-sharing arrangement concluded in 1991, Japan is assuming all labor and utilities costs such that, by 1995, Japan will bear virtually all costs of United States forces stationed on its soil.

Second, the Republic of Korea provides land and facilities for United States use; logistics support including ammunition storage and equipment maintenance; and manpower augmentees to United States Army units. These contributions represent roughly \$2 billion a year. In addition, Korea has agreed to assume by 1995 a cost-sharing contribution equal to roughly one-third of won-based stationing costs—for example, labor, construction, and operations and maintenance. Korea is also assuming the lead role in our defense alliance. For example, on December 1, 1992, a Korean general assumed command over combined United States and South Korean ground forces.

Third, our allies provide significant levels of economic assistance to developing nations worldwide, in addition to contributing aid to the nations of Eastern Europe, and to the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union. This percentage is likely to increase as the Congress requires further reductions in U.S. foreign assistance programs.

Fourth, a year ago, NATO agreed—in response to a U.S. request—to an important change in the Infrastructure Program: extending eligibility for common funding to operations and maintenance costs, specifically those O&M costs borne by the United States to operate reinforcement facilities. The United States annually pays about \$275 million in such costs.

This is not to suggest that we should end our efforts to achieve more equitable burdensharing arrangements with our allies. Indeed, the U.S. Government is presently exploring with our allies a variety of ways to reduce our stationing costs, such as seeking additional in-kind support, reducing local national employment costs, waiving or reducing fees and taxes, and increasing cooperative programs.

It does suggest, however, that in designing burdensharing strategies for NATO and our Pacific allies, we should eschew a one-formula-fits-all approach to the issue. Instead, it is critical to tailor our objectives to strategic and political characteristics of each alliance, as well as to the military, political, and economic circumstances of each ally.

Of the four burdensharing amendments before us today, only the Lloyd-Sisisky amendment takes such developments into account.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, my colleagues should be aware that the administration strongly opposes the Bryant, Schroeder and Frank amendments. In a September 7, 1993, letter from Secretary of State Warren Christopher and Secretary of Defense Les Aspin, they state:

[These amendments] would jeopardize our country's ability to sustain its strategic interests abroad. If enacted into law, these amendments would force the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe, and with them would go our leadership position in European affairs, and our ability to promote and protect our vital national interests there. . . . These proposed amendments run contrary to U.S. interests and would portend disastrous consequences, certainly a diminution of American prestige and leadership, U.S. European presence, and regional and world influence. What the United States has achieved in Europe over the past half century would be in jeopardy.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the Bryant, Frank, and Schroeder amendments, and to support the Lloyd-Sisisky amendment.

Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: When the Defense Authorization bills reach the floor, amendments will be considered requiring increased allied burdensharing, which would jeopardize our country's ability to sustain its strategic interests abroad.

These proposed amendments would generally * * * force structures, require higher percentages of allied contributions, or reduce anticipated Operations and Maintenance budgets.

It is our assessment, after substantial, very directed and detailed discussions with the Europeans that our burdensharing negotiations with major European allies will not conceivably yield the contributions called for by these proposals. As a result, if enacted into law, these amendments would force the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe, and with them would go our leadership position in European affairs, and our ability to promote and protect our vital national interests there.

The President has re-affirmed the United States commitments to NATO, Japan and Korea to maintain our forward military presence. The President made these commitments largely because they represent our own vital strategic interests. The post Cold War period has brought new dangers and instability that threaten our fundamental interests.

Our allied security arrangements with the U.S. forward-deployed presence are the underpinning of our larger vital interests in the world. They contribute immeasurably to world peace; the expansion of democracy and human rights; access to open markets and economic growth opportunities; long-term stability; and democratic consolidation across the region, especially in Eastern Europe, Russia and the newly-independent states of the former Soviet Union.

We share the Congress' concern about equitable burdensharing, and this remains a primary Administration policy. However, the

proposed amendments run contrary to U.S. interests and would portend disastrous consequences, certainly a diminution of American prestige and leadership, U.S. European presence, and regional and world influence. What the United States has achieved in Europe over the past half century would be in jeopardy.

We will continue to negotiate vigorously arrangements with our allies that seek to be more beneficial to the United States. The Administration pledges to do its utmost to achieve the lowest possible stationing costs through determined negotiations with our allies, in return for a reasonable level of funding for an adequate forward-deployed force that is ready and capable of carrying out U.S. and collective missions.

But more importantly, the Clinton Administration intends to undertake with our NATO allies a wide-ranging review of our mutual commitments to trans-Atlantic and European regional security through an enlarged concept of security responsibility sharing. The objective is to take us beyond the old, sterile approaches of the Cold War, and seek new understandings with our allies in the areas of defense planning; resource management; cost sharing and policy management, including sharing new roles and missions involving the emerging democracies of central and eastern Europe, peace-keeping, conflict prevention, and humanitarian relief, among others.

NATO remains the key to stability in Europe. U.S. leadership is vital to the Alliance's future, and we can continue to lead only as long as we maintain the readiness of our forward-deployed forces. We will keep you and the other members of Congress fully apprised on our progress in achieving the goals and objectives of our new strategy. We need Congress as a partner in this endeavor.

WARREN CHRISTOPHER,
Secretary of State.

LES ASPIN,
Secretary of Defense.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I do want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their tremendous bipartisan support on this amendment. Certainly I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] for his outstanding leadership on this NATO panel as well.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would respond to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] by saying if we are going to start talking about protecting our many varied interests, how about protecting the interests of the people in the United States with a decent health care plan? How about protecting them from crime, and letting them have a decent education system?

Have you looked at what they have in Europe today? We in America today have a homicide rate 10 times higher than they do in Europe. We have a rate of rape seven times higher than Europe. We have four times more robberies than they do in Europe at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr.

SPENCE] and the other advocates on this side of the status quo that it is about time we stopped subsidizing the Europeans and Japanese and protecting them, and took some of that money and started protecting the American people.

I would like to see our people have a health care plan. I would like to see our people have freedom from fear on the streets. I would like to see our young people educated to the extent they educate them in Europe and Japan. We cannot do it when we spend \$150 billion a year subsidizing the defense of the Europeans and the Japanese and others.

Mr. Chairman, these are common-sense amendments here today that call upon us to make a simple decision: Are we going to continue borrowing billions of dollars and giving it away to the Europeans and the Japanese, who, after all, are well able to support themselves, or are we going to take that money and begin to balance our own budget and deal with our problems here in the United States?

Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply says that by the year 2000 either they are going to pay the full cost of our defense of their part of the world, or we are going to be pulling out. Surely, my goodness, 48 years after World War II, we can surely make that decision today, a decision that would simply say that by the year 2000 you Europeans and you Japanese and others, by golly, it is time for you to pay for your own defense. We need that money here in the United States to pay for the defense of the American people.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. At the heart of this debate is the issue of defining and maintaining our country's ability to sustain its strategic interests abroad.

It should be clear to each and every Member that our allied security arrangements in Europe, Japan, and in Korea serve as the underpinning of our larger vital interests in the world. Those vital interests cannot be protected without a substantial U.S. forward-deployed presence.

That presence, and the associated leadership and prestige it brings, is at risk if the House were to take action to force untenable reductions in our forces in Europe and elsewhere in the world. As Secretary Christopher and Secretary Aspin spelled out yesterday in a letter to the Congress—a substantial U.S. forward-deployed presence abroad contributes immeasurably to world peace; to the expansion of democracy and human rights; access to open markets and economic growth opportunities; long-term stability; and

democratic consolidation across the region, especially in Eastern Europe, Russia, and the newly Independent States of the former Soviet Union.

This is not to say that the United States should not continue to vigorously pursue arrangements with our allies that seek to be more beneficial to the United States. Indeed the American people deserve no less. But we must remind the American people that cutting U.S. forces abroad too far and too fast undercuts U.S. interests.

Some would have us believe that no U.S. forces abroad have been withdrawn. To the contrary, since 1986 the number of U.S. personnel permanently stationed overseas has been reduced by almost 200,000. In addition, the total number of U.S. military facilities overseas has been reduced by about 50 percent since 1990 and the United States is cutting bases overseas more quickly than domestic bases.

In this time of rapid change and uncertainty, it is essential that the United States demonstrate continuity of resolve and commitment in upholding its end of the transatlantic relationship. To that end, the Congress should work to maintain and enhance NATO's position as the principal guarantor of transatlantic security interests and as a viable political-military influence in Europe.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Bryant, Schroeder, and Frank amendment and for the Lloyd/Sisisky amendment.

□ 1240

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for the evenhanded way in which she is allocating the time. I certainly plan to vote for the amendment that she and the gentleman from Virginia have put forward, but I find no conflict between that and the amendments of my colleagues.

We are at a critical juncture. The question is, will the American economy get the benefit of the collapse of the Soviet empire? The United States has, since early in the 1940's, been a major source of manpower and money to save much of the rest of the world from threats to its freedom.

We have had a great deal of success. Yes, there continue to be in the world people who mean us no good. There are people who run countries and who, in the rational scheme of things, would not be allowed to drive cars. But there is a qualitative difference between the Nazis and the Soviet threat to our very existence as a society and the kind of problems we face today. And it is a difference which allows us to make a substantial reduction in the amount that we spend, particularly in a force per-

manently stationed in one of the richest areas of the globe, Western Europe.

Our Western European allies now confront a zero threat. We have been told, in the absence of Communism, leave the troops in case trouble should break out, for instance, in Yugoslavia. And when trouble broke out in Yugoslavia, those European allies, who are the beneficiaries of the billions, hundreds of billions we have spent, said "Don't do anything."

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that I agree with every word the gentleman has just uttered. The question here is whether Uncle Sam is going to be Uncle Sam or Uncle Sucker. It is time we stopped playing the sucker.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. It is clear that the most widely read book in Western Europe is Tom Sawyer. Not only have we been painting their fences, we pay for the privilege of doing it. We are not talking about diminishing one iota our ability to defend ourselves or our ability to respond to those in need. But the permanent stationing of 100,000 or more American troops does nothing but to stimulate the European economy at great cost to our own.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. CHAPMAN). The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I just wish this debate were on saving the taxpayers over \$1 billion by bringing our troops home from Somalia. The distinguished gentleman from West Virginia in the other body is trying to do this right now. That is the amendment we should be voting on here today, because we would support it on this side.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 45 seconds to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Burdensharing, that is getting our allies to pay an increased share of the amounts necessary to provide for our national security as well as theirs, is something that I believe we can all agree on.

Some of the amendments that we will discuss later today to accomplish this goal, in my opinion, are well-thought-out and I intend to support them. Others are, in my opinion, over-reactions and, in my opinion, ill-advised.

The practical effect of some of the actions that some would take today would be to simply withdraw our forces by the year 2000 from our forward deployed positions.

I would just ask my friends on the other side of the aisle to remember just a few short years ago, when we needed to get into the deserts of Saudi Arabia in a hurry. I would make the point that it would have been well nigh impossible for us to do the same kind of deployment that we did during that action, if we had not had our forward-deployed force.

In addition, I would point out that U.S. power projection, our global base structure, our lift and logistics capabilities, our maritime forces all depend on some degree of sustained, reasonable forward deployment. It is not that we like to have people away from home. It is not that there is some magic reason that is subject to some discussion as to why we ought to be there. But withdrawing or sharply reducing our forces in Europe would be the practical effect of some of the burden sharing amendments today.

I urge my colleagues to do the responsible thing and look at each of these amendments as they come up with an eye toward being sure that we have the type of forward deployment that is essential to our national security.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER], a hard-working distinguished member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment by my distinguished colleague from Colorado.

This Congress established a base-closing process that was meant to be effective and fair. If bases in the United States were being closed while bases overseas were left untouched, I would be the first to say the process was unfair.

But such inequity is not the case, Mr. Chairman. Our bases overseas are being closed. The number of defense sites or installations overseas where operations have ended or been reduced now stands at 840.

President Clinton has stated his intention to drawdown to 100,000 troops in Europe by September of 1996. That means additional overseas base closure announcements will be forthcoming.

The Defense Department plan is to reduce the overseas base structure by almost 40 percent from cold war levels.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, passage of this amendment would put our base closure commissioners square in the middle of complex treaty and status-of-forces agreement negotiations with foreign nations.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to our distinguished leader on the committee, the ranking Republican of the Subcommit-

tee on Military Installation and Facilities, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I am sure the chairman will be glad to know that I just became chairman.

Let me just say to my friend that the idea of burdensharing is an important idea, and it is important to prod our allies and to try to get them to pick up some of this massive cost of keeping the world free. They are reluctant, and it does take pressure by Congress.

I want to address myself to the Schroeder amendment that will be coming up that would place the closure of foreign bases under the purview of the domestic Base Closing Commission and just tell colleagues that with respect to closing foreign bases, things are working.

We are closing foreign bases. We have closed now some 840 worldwide; since 1990, some 773 in Europe.

While some Members will say some of those were simply radar sites and small unit bases, that is accompanied by a drawdown in personnel of about 150,000 personnel since 1990. So if we look at this chart, we have gone from 304,000 people in Europe, fiscal year 1990, to about 164,000 today. Base closing in Europe is working.

I think if we put base closing under the Commission, we are going to slow it down. They are already stretched logistically. If we throw it in the pot with all the domestic bases, we are going to have a slower drawdown in Europe than we would have otherwise.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my views on the four so-called burdensharing amendments to H.R. 2401 made in order by the rule.

I am strongly opposed to the Bryant amendment which requires U.S. allies to pay 100 percent of our overseas costs or else all U.S. troops must be withdrawn. This amendment fails to recognize that the United States maintains forward deployed forces in order to promote democracy, enhance stability and deter would be aggressors in regions where the United States has critical economic, political and security interests. Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "No" on the Bryant amendment.

I am also strongly opposed to the Frank amendment which would reduce DOD fiscal year 1994 funds for military activities in Europe by \$1 billion. Deep cuts in the budget for overseas Defense activities, as required by the Frank amendment, would result in a considerable loss in the readiness of U.S. Forces stationed in Europe and/or deeper reductions in the number of U.S. Forces stationed there. As such, the practical effect of this amendment could be to force a return to the hollow forces of the 1970's in a region where the United States maintains critical economic, political, and security interests.

I should remind my colleagues that United States Forces based in Europe are responsible for promoting and defending America's interests across some 82 nations, in an area of responsibility that encompasses not just Europe, but also parts of the Near East, North Africa, and sub-Saharan Africa. In the past year alone, these forces have been called upon to perform a wide variety of challenging missions—for example, emergency evacuations of U.S. citizens, humanitarian relief, monitoring and enforcing U.N. resolutions, and providing surveillance of suspected drug traffickers.

My colleagues should also be aware that Defense overseas funding has already been cut by approximately 30 percent since fiscal year 1992. It may surprise some of my colleagues to know that contrary to the grossly inaccurate conventional wisdom, less than 10 percent of the annual U.S. Defense budget is actually allocated for overseas defense activities of U.S. troops. In addition, the basing infrastructure in Europe has already been significantly reduced. To date, the United States has announced the closure or realignment of over 50 percent of the installations we occupied at the start of the drawdown in January 1990.

It is vital that the United States sustain a credible force presence in Europe. As Gen. John Shalikashvili, our next JCS Chairman, has observed:

Our military contribution [to NATO] is significant compared to those of other member nations; so is our influence. Nothing can be more favorable for U.S. interests in Europe than to retain that degree of influence.

Yet the approach recommended by Mr. FRANK, if adopted, could result in a dramatic decline in America's ability to influence events in Europe and throughout parts of Africa and Asia. Furthermore, it could result in a regional military force that is increasingly hollow and unable to perform the missions it will inevitably be called upon to conduct. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "No" on the Frank amendment.

Likewise, I oppose the Schroeder amendment which would require the 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission to include foreign bases along with domestic bases in its closure recommendations and require that at least 25 percent of the bases recommended for closure be overseas facilities.

If enacted, the Schroeder amendment would slow the process of closing or realigning overseas military bases considerably. The United States is reducing overseas bases far more rapidly than here at home. The number of defense sites or installations overseas where operations have ended or been reduced now stands at 840. In light of President Clinton's stated intention to drawdown to 100,000 troops in Europe by September 1996, additional overseas base closure announcements will be forthcoming. The DOD plan is to reduce the overseas base structure by approximately 40 percent from cold war levels, consistent with planned reductions in personnel stationed overseas.

In addition, the Schroeder amendment would greatly complicate U.S. foreign policy by involving civilian base closure commissioners

in complex treaty and status-of-forces agreement negotiations with foreign nations regarding the residual value of base properties, etc. Such an approach is both undesirable, unrealistic, and untenable. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment offered by my colleague, Mrs. SCHROEDER.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I support the Lloyd-Sisisky amendment which takes into account the progress in burdensharing negotiations with our allies that has occurred over the past several years. Many of these developments were noted in a May 1993, Department of Defense report to Congress entitled, "Allied Contributions to the Common Defense."

Let me briefly remind my colleagues of some of these positive developments. First, Japan currently funds virtually all DOD in-country construction costs and provides, at no charge, land and facilities used by United States Forces. These contributions represent roughly \$3 billion a year in direct outlays, foregone receipts, and opportunity costs. In addition, under the cost-sharing arrangement concluded in 1991, Japan is assuming all labor and utilities costs such that, by 1995, Japan will bear virtually all costs of United States Forces stationed on its soil.

Second, the Republic of Korea provides land and facilities for United States use; logistics support including ammunition storage and equipment maintenance; and manpower augmentees to United States Army units. These contributions represent roughly \$2 billion a year. In addition, Korea has agreed to assume by 1995 a cost-sharing contribution equal to roughly one-third of won-based stationing costs, e.g., labor, construction, and operations and maintenance. Korea is also assuming the lead role in our defense alliance. For example, on December 1, 1992, a Korean general assumed command over combined United States and South Korean ground forces.

Third, our allies provide significant levels of economic assistance to developing nations worldwide, in addition to contributing aid to the nations of Eastern Europe, and to the newly independent States of the former Soviet Union. This percentage is likely to increase as the Congress requires further reductions in U.S. foreign assistance programs.

Fourth, a year ago, NATO agreed—in response to a U.S. request—to an important change in the Infrastructure Program: Extending eligibility for common funding to operations and maintenance costs, specifically, those O&M costs borne by the United States to operate reinforcement facilities. The United States annually pays about \$275 million in such costs.

This is not to suggest that we should end our efforts to achieve more equitable burdensharing arrangements with our allies. Indeed, the U.S. Government is presently exploring with our allies a variety of ways to reduce our stationing costs, such as seeking additional in-kind support, reducing local national employment costs, waiving or reducing fees and taxes, and increasing cooperative programs.

It does suggest, however, that in designing burdensharing strategies for NATO and our Pacific allies, we should eschew a one-for-

mula-fits-all approach to the issue. Instead, it is critical to tailor our objectives to strategic and political characteristics of each alliance, as well as to the military, political, and economic circumstances of each ally.

Of the four burdensharing amendments before us today, only the Lloyd-Sisisky amendment takes such developments into account.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, my colleagues should be aware that the administration strongly opposes the Bryant, Schroeder and Frank amendments. In a September 7, 1993, letter from Secretary of State Warren Christopher and Secretary of Defense Les Aspin, they state:

*** [these amendments] would jeopardize our country's ability to sustain its strategic interests abroad *** If enacted into law, these amendments would force the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe, and with them would go our leadership position in European affairs, and our ability to promote and protect our vital national interests there. *** These proposed amendments run contrary to U.S. interests and would portend disastrous consequences, certainly a diminution of American prestige and leadership, U.S. European presence, and regional and world influence. What the United States has achieved in Europe over the past half century would be in jeopardy."

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the Bryant, Frank, and Schroeder amendments, and to support the Lloyd-Sisisky amendment.

Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: When the Defense Authorization bills reach the floor, amendments will be considered requiring increased allied burdensharing which jeopardize our country's ability to sustain its strategic interests abroad.

These proposed amendments would generally *** structures, require higher percentages of allied contributions, or reduce anticipated Operations and Maintenance budgets.

It is our assessment, after substantial, very directed and detailed discussions with the Europeans that our burdensharing negotiations with major European allies will not conceivably yield the contributions called for by these proposals. As a result, if enacted into law, these amendments would force the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe, and with them would go our leadership position in European affairs, and our ability to promote and protect our vital national interests there.

The President has re-affirmed the United States commitments to NATO, Japan and Korea to maintain our forward military presence. The President made these commitments largely because they represent our own vital strategic interests. The post Cold War period has brought new dangers and instability that threaten our fundamental interests.

Our allied security arrangements with the U.S. forward-deployed presence are the underpinning of our larger vital interests in the world. They contribute immeasurably to world peace; the expansion of democracy and human rights; access to open markets and economic growth opportunities; long-term stability; and democratic consolidation across the region, especially in Eastern Europe, Russia and the newly-independent states of the former Soviet Union.

We share the Congress' concern about equitable burdensharing, and this remains a primary Administration policy. However, the proposed amendments run contrary to U.S. interests and would portend disastrous consequences, certainly a diminution of American prestige and leadership, U.S. European presence, and regional and world influence. What the United States has achieved in Europe over the past half century would be in jeopardy.

We will continue to negotiate vigorously arrangements with our allies that seek to be more beneficial to the United States. The Administration pledges to do its utmost to achieve the lowest possible stationing costs through determined negotiations with our allies, in return for a reasonable level of funding for an adequate forward-deployed force that is ready and capable of carrying out U.S. and collective missions.

But more importantly, the Clinton Administration intends to undertake with our NATO allies a wide-ranging review of our mutual commitments to trans-Atlantic and European regional security through an enlarged concept of security responsibility sharing. The objective is to take us beyond the cold, sterile approaches of the Cold War, and seek new understandings with our allies in the areas of defense planning; resource management; cost sharing and policy management, including sharing new roles and missions involving the emerging democracies of central and eastern Europe, peacekeeping, conflict prevention, and humanitarian relief, among others.

NATO remains the key to stability in Europe. U.S. leadership is vital to the Alliance's future, and we can continue to lead only as long as we maintain the readiness of our forward-deployed forces. We will keep you and the other members of Congress fully apprised on our progress in achieving the goals and objectives of our new strategy. We need Congress as a partner in this endeavor.

WARREN CHRISTOPHER,

Secretary of State.

LES ASPIN,

Secretary of Defense.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time for general debate having now expired, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part 3 of House Report 103-223.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRYANT

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRYANT: At the end of title X, insert the following section:

SEC. 1043. REQUIREMENT TO USE SAVINGS FROM BURDENSARING CONTRIBUTIONS FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION.

(a) BURDENSARING AGREEMENTS.—(1) As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President should enter into negotiations for purposes of revising the host-nation agreement with each foreign country described in paragraph (2). A revised host-nation agreement is an agreement under which the foreign country agrees to assume, beginning on or before September 30, 1996, all costs incurred by the United States related to the presence of all United States military personnel stationed in the country. The agreement may provide for the phased-in assumption of such costs over the three-year period beginning on October 1, 1993, and ending on September 30, 1996.

(2) Paragraph (1) applies with respect to—
(A) each country of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (other than the United States);

(B) Japan; and

(C) Korea.

(b) TROOP WITHDRAWAL.—If a revised host-nation agreement described in subsection (a) is not entered into by September 30, 1996, in a country to which subsection (a) applies, the President shall order the withdrawal of all United States Armed Forces assigned to permanent duty ashore in that country. The President may provide for the phased-in withdrawal of such forces over the four-year period beginning on October 1, 1996, and ending on September 30, 2000.

(c) USE OF SAVINGS REALIZED.—The savings realized each fiscal year as a result of the assumption of an increased share of United States costs by the foreign countries to which subsection (a) applies shall be used for deficit reduction.

(d) REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall include in the annual report required by section 1304 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484; 106 Stat. 2546) the following information:

(1) For each foreign country to which subsection (a) applies, the costs to the United States of maintaining and operating each United States military installation in that country during the preceding fiscal year.

(2) For each such military installation, the savings realized during the preceding fiscal year (if any) as a result of the assumption of an increased share of United States costs by the host nation.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

□ 1250

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment which has been reported by the Committee on Rules, which would provide that a host nation agreement be negotiated by the President, under which foreign countries which we are now subsidizing will agree to assume, beginning on or before September 30, 1996, 3 years from now, all costs, 100 percent of the costs, incurred by the United States related to the presence of our military personnel stationed in that country. It does not say that we withdraw, it says that our allies who wish to have us present in their territory will pay 100 percent of the cost of that.

If they do not pay 100 percent of the cost of it, then a phased-in withdrawal will occur, resulting in the removal of our troops from that country by September 30 of the year 2000.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that it has been almost 50 years since the end of

World War II. Those who are seeking in Europe today to protect the Europeans from, since the cold war is over, a threat that is not entirely clear or definable, are no longer those who fought in World War II, nor are they even the sons of those who fought in World War II, they are the grandsons and granddaughters, and in some cases the great-grandsons and great-granddaughters of those who fought in that conflict.

I think we have to face the question ultimately, and today is the day to do it, of how long we are going to continue to subsidize the defense of First World countries who are well able to pay their own way, and in fact do pay their own way in all other respects.

How long are we going to continue to borrow from the future, borrow from the inheritance of our own children, and give the money away to the Europeans and to the Japanese and others in the form of a subsidy of their defense while we are unable to balance our own budget or even to meet fundamental requirements of a government, such as education, health care, and protection from crime?

I read some statistics just a moment ago. It is no surprise to me that we have fallen so far behind the Europeans and Japanese in so many indicators of social strength when we are paying the cost of the greatest and most expensive expenditure of our Government, defense, while they are able to get by paying only a fraction.

For example, when we look at the rate of crime in those countries, as I said during the general debate, our homicide rate is 10 times that of the Europeans. Our rate of rape is seven times that of the Europeans.

I submit to the Members, it is time to stop paying to protect the Europeans from an unknown threat. It is time for us to begin paying to protect the American people from a known threat: crime, ignorance, a deficit in training necessary to compete worldwide, and a lack of health care.

There is an amendment that gives us until the year 2000. Surely by the year 2000 it is time for us to say to them, "You pay the cost of your own defense. We in the United States need to balance our budget and provide the basics for our people, just as you have been able to provide the basics for your people due to a subsidy by the American taxpayer for so long."

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in the strongest possible disagreement with the amendment offered by our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT]. I could be partisan in this debate and say we should accept this amendment because, like my colleagues, I also agree, we should as much as possible get our allies to bear their proper share

of the costs of their defense as well as our national security interests.

Mr. Chairman, I also have a responsibility here to be responsible as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and having looked into this with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I am willing to listen to what the President of this country, who is not of my party, and his Secretary of Defense and his Secretary of State have said about this amendment, and one of the other amendments that will be offered today.

I would like to quote from that letter, which was written to our committee chairman. This is what Les Aspin and Warren Christopher said the amendment would do in terms of having an effect on our foreign policy:

It runs contrary to U.S. interests, and would portend disastrous consequences: certainly a diminution of American prestige and leadership, U.S. European presence, and regional and world influence. What the United States has achieved in Europe over the past half century would be in jeopardy.

We on this side of the aisle could play the partisan game. We could support this amendment, and we could then have the President and the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense put into an embarrassing position, because they know full well they cannot sustain the gentleman's amendment.

However, we are not going to do that. We are going to stand with this President. We are going to stand with Warren Christopher. We are going to stand with Les Aspin and do what is responsible.

I ask my colleagues to overwhelmingly oppose the gentleman's amendment, support the President, support the Secretary of Defense, and support the Secretary of State.

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON. I am pleased to yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment to thank the gentleman for his statement. I want to make a point that we are not there just to protect Europeans, it is United States interests that are at stake. The gentleman cited the letter from the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, and the bottom line is the U.S. forces stationed abroad are not mercenaries. Burden-sharing is important. We are not there doing their bidding, we are there protecting our interests. That is what we should be mindful of in this debate.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his excellent comments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. CHAPMAN). The gentleman from Texas has the right to close, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PICKETT].

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to my distinguished colleague's amendment.

The gentleman's amendment pursues a worthy objective, one that I have shared for years in my service on the Armed Services Committee. But it takes the wrong approach.

Let us look at what the amendment does. If the allied governments do not cough up funding for U.S. presence, then we begin to withdraw our troops. I submit that the decision on U.S. troop levels overseas is one that rests with the American people through their Congress and should not be left by default to be decided by European countries, depending upon their level of legislative funding support.

Yes; we need to demand more financial support from our allies. Yes; it is time for our negotiators to get serious. But tying our Nation's troop strength to host nation dollars is the wrong way to go.

That is why I urge my colleagues to support an amendment that will be offered later by Representatives LLOYD and SISISKY that provides for a more measured approach to the issue of burdensharing. It is tough in that it reduces \$580 million this year from overseas spending. It takes a hard line on negotiations with our allies. But it does not allow the foreign nations to dictate our presence. It keeps the prerogatives for American national security in the hands of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment of Mr. BRYANT and support the more measured approach that will be offered by Representatives LLOYD and SISISKY.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of our time to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I rise to reluctantly oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], and I will be voting for other burdensharing amendments later, is that it implies only our interests are at stake, and particularly in Japan. Let us take Japan for a minute. Recently Japan was paying \$2.5 billion out of a \$6 billion tab incurred to keep our troops there. That is about 40 percent. Under a 1991 agreement, that now rises to 75 percent that will be paid by the Japanese of the costs of stationing United States troops. I think that is very, very significant.

Is it only Japanese interests at stake? This is our major Northern Pa-

cific base. We are not in the Philippines any more. This is our Pacific base. We have China unsteady, we have Russia going through its throes, and the other nations in that area. We have North Korea always unpredictable. Certainly, it is not just Japan that has a vital interest in the United States being able to project its force from the bases in Japan.

I would urge rejection of this amendment. I think it certainly sends the wrong message.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] has 1½ minutes remaining to close debate.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to see my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia, rise in support of a nation that very definitely has an interest in us continuing the status quo. Japan, which spends only 1 percent of its gross domestic product on defense, while we in the United States spend 5.2 percent, while we in the United States run a \$50 billion budget trade deficit with the Japanese, yes, they have an interest in our continuing to pay their bills.

I urgently implore my colleagues not to postpone this decision any longer. Surely 50 years, almost 50 years since the end of World War II, we can make a decision that by the year 2000 we will no longer continue to subsidize the defense of First World allies who do a better job than we do in balancing their budgets, a better job than we do in educating their people, providing health care, and protecting their people from crime.

The front page of today's Washington Post says we have 90 million Americans who are only marginally literate, who can only perform the most fundamental tasks in terms of computations and reading.

□ 1300

Surely it is time for us to stop subsidizing these nations that outcompete us today, that do not cut us any slack when it comes time to make trade agreements, and that do a better job of educating and preparing their people, and start using these dollars not to protect countries that can well pay to protect themselves, but use these dollars to protect the American people from a future that may very well be bleak unless we recognize our responsibility to our own fiscal soundness today.

I urge Members to vote aye on the Bryant amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 231, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 417]

AYES—195

Abercrombie	Green	Pastor
Andrews (ME)	Greenwood	Payne (NJ)
Andrews (NJ)	Hall (TX)	Pelosi
Andrews (TX)	Hamburg	Peterson (MN)
Applegate	Hastings	Petri
Baessler	Hayes	Pombo
Ballenger	Hefner	Pomeroy
Barca	Herger	Poshard
Barcia	Hilliard	Pryce (OH)
Barlow	Hinchey	Rahall
Barrett (WI)	Hobson	Ramstad
Becerra	Hochbrueckner	Rangel
Blackwell	Holden	Ravenel
Bonior	Horn	Regula
Borski	Hunter	Reynolds
Boucher	Inslie	Roberts
Brown (CA)	Jacobs	Rohrabacher
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Romero-Barcelo
Bryant	Johnson (SD)	(PR)
Burton	Johnson, E.B.	Roth
Byrne	Kanjorski	Rowland
Camp	Kaptur	Royce
Canady	Kennedy	Rush
Cardin	Kildee	Sanders
Carr	Kleczka	Sangmeister
Chapman	Klein	Schenk
Clay	Klink	Schiff
Coble	Kopetski	Schroeder
Collins (IL)	Kreidler	Schumer
Condit	LaFalce	Scott
Costello	Lambert	Sensenbrenner
Coyne	Lantos	Serrano
Crane	LaRocco	Sharp
Cunningham	Laughlin	Shepherd
Danner	Lehman	Slattery
de Lugo (VI)	Lewis (FL)	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Dellums	Lightfoot	Strickland
Deutsch	Lipinski	Studds
Dingell	Long	Stupak
Doolittle	Lowey	Swett
Dreier	Markey	Taylor (MS)
Duncan	Martinez	Taylor (NC)
Durbin	McDermott	Thompson
Edwards (CA)	McHale	Thurman
Engel	McInnis	Torres
English (OK)	McKinney	Torricelli
Eshoo	Meehan	Towns
Evans	Menendez	Trafficant
Everett	Mica	Tucker
Ewing	Miller (CA)	Unsoeld
Faleomavaega	Miller (FL)	Upton
(AS)	Minge	Velazquez
Farr	Mink	Vento
Fields (LA)	Moakley	Washington
Filner	Murphy	Waters
Fingerhut	Nadler	Watt
Flake	Natcher	Wheat
Foglietta	Neal (MA)	Wilson
Ford (MI)	Norton (DC)	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Nussle	Wyden
Franks (NJ)	Oberstar	Wynn
Frost	Obey	Yates
Furse	Owens	Young (FL)
Gejdenson	Pallone	Zimmer
Gillmor	Parker	

NOES—231

Ackerman	Berman	Buyer
Allard	Bevill	Calvert
Archer	Billbray	Cantwell
Army	Billirakis	Castle
Bacchus (FL)	Bishop	Clayton
Bachus (AL)	Bliley	Clement
Baker (CA)	Blute	Clinger
Baker (LA)	Boehlert	Clyburn
Barrett (NE)	Boehner	Coleman
Bartlett	Bonilla	Collins (GA)
Barton	Brewster	Combest
Bateman	Brooks	Cooper
Bellenson	Browder	Coppersmith
Bentley	Brown (FL)	Cox
Bereuter	Bunning	Cramer

Crapo	Johnston	Price (NC)
Darden	Kasich	Quillen
de la Garza	Kennelly	Quinn
Deal	Kim	Reed
DeLauro	King	Richardson
DeLay	Kingston	Ridge
Derrick	Klug	Roemer
Diaz-Balart	Knollenberg	Rogers
Dickey	Kolbe	Ros-Lehtinen
Dicks	Kyl	Rose
Dixon	Lancaster	Rostenkowski
Dooley	Lazio	Roukema
Dornan	Leach	Roybal-Allard
Dunn	Levin	Sabo
Edwards (TX)	Levy	Santorum
Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Sarpalius
English (AZ)	Linder	Sawyer
Fawell	Livingston	Saxton
Fazio	Lloyd	Schaefer
Fields (TX)	Machtley	Shaw
Fish	Maloney	Shays
Fowler	Mann	Shuster
Franks (CT)	Manton	Siskis
Galegley	Manzullo	Skaggs
Gallo	Margolies-	Skeen
Gekas	Mezvisky	Skelton
Gephardt	Matsui	Smith (IA)
Geren	Mazzoli	Smith (MI)
Gibbons	McCandless	Smith (NJ)
Gilchrest	McCloskey	Smith (OR)
Gilman	McCollum	Smith (TX)
Gingrich	McCrery	Snowe
Glickman	McCurdy	Solomon
Gonzalez	McDade	Spence
Goodlatte	McHugh	Spratt
Goodling	McKeon	Stearns
Gordon	McMillan	Stenholm
Goss	McNulty	Stump
Grams	Meek	Sundquist
Grandy	Meyers	Swift
Gunderson	Michel	Synar
Gutierrez	Mineta	Talent
Hall (OH)	Mollinari	Tanner
Hamilton	Mollohan	Tejeda
Hancock	Montgomery	Thomas (CA)
Hansen	Moorhead	Thomas (WY)
Harman	Moran	Thornton
Hastert	Morrell	Torkildsen
Hefley	Murtha	Underwood (GU)
Hoagland	Myers	Valentine
Hoekstra	Olver	Viscolsky
Houghton	Ortiz	Volkmer
Hoyer	Orton	Walker
Huffington	Oxley	Walsh
Hughes	Packard	Waxman
Hutchinson	Paxon	Weldon
Hutto	Payne (VA)	Whitten
Inglis	Penny	Williams
Inhofe	Peterson (FL)	Wise
Istook	Pickett	Wolf
Johnson (CT)	Pickle	Zeliff
Johnson (GA)	Porter	
Johnson, Sam	Portman	

NOT VOTING—12

Callahan	Hoke	Stokes
Collins (MI)	Hyde	Tauzin
Conyers	Mfume	Vucanovich
Ford (TN)	Neal (NC)	Young (AK)

□ 1321

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Stokes for, with Mrs. Vucanovich against.

Mrs. ROUKEMA changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. RUSH, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Messrs. WYNN, EWING, and HILLIARD changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part 3 of House Report 103-223.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SCHROEDER

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SCHROEDER: At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 2919. EXPANSION OF BASE CLOSURE LAW TO INCLUDE CONSIDERATION OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES FOR CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT.

(a) EXPANSION OF SCOPE OF BASE CLOSURE LAW.—The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 2910 and 2911 as sections 2911 and 2912, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 2909 the following new section:

"SEC. 2910. CONSIDERATION OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

"(a) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TERMINATION AND REDUCTIONS OF MILITARY OPERATIONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—With respect to recommendations made in 1995 for the closure and realignment of military installations under this part, the Secretary and the Commission shall include recommendations for the termination and reduction of military operations carried out by the United States at military installations outside the United States.

"(b) SELECTION CRITERIA.—(1) Not later than December 31, 1993, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register and transmit to the congressional defense committees the criteria proposed to be used by the Department of Defense in making recommendations for terminating and reducing military operations carried out by the United States at military installations outside the United States. The Secretary shall provide an opportunity for public comment on the proposed criteria for a period of at least 30 days and shall include notice of that opportunity in the publication required under the preceding sentence.

"(2) Not later than February 15, 1994, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register and transmit to the congressional defense committees the final criteria to be used in making recommendations for terminating and reducing military operations carried out by the United States at military installations outside the United States.

"(3) The criteria developed under this subsection, along with the force-structure plan referred to in section 2903(a), shall be the final criteria to be used in making recommendations for terminating and reducing military operations carried out by the United States, unless the criteria are—

"(A) disapproved by a joint resolution of Congress enacted on or before March 15, 1994; or

"(B) amended by the Secretary in the manner described in section 2903(b)(2)(B).

"(c) RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall transmit recommendations to the Commission for the termination and reduction of military operations of the United States at specified military installations outside the United States. The recommendations shall be included in the recommendations transmitted to the Commission with respect to the closure and realignment of military installations inside the United States under section 2903(c).

"(d) REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY COMMISSION.—The Commission shall review

the recommendations transmitted by the Secretary under subsection (c). The Commission may make changes in the recommendations made by the Secretary only in the manner provided in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) of section 2903(d)(2). The Commission shall include, in its recommendations to the President under section 2903(d), its recommendations for the termination and reduction of military operations of the United States at specified military installations outside the United States.

"(e) REVIEW AND TRANSMITTAL BY THE PRESIDENT.—The recommendations transmitted by the President under section 2903(e) shall contain the recommendations of the Commission for the termination and reduction of military operations of the United States at specified military installations outside the United States."

(b) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO INCLUDE SUFFICIENT OVERSEAS INSTALLATIONS.—Section 2903 of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) FAILURE TO INCLUDE SUFFICIENT OVERSEAS INSTALLATIONS.—(1) In the case of the recommendations of the Commission required to be transmitted to the Congress in 1995 pursuant to subsection (e), if the closure or realignment of military installations outside the United States does not account for at least 25 percent of the closure and realignment recommendations of the Commission, as certified by the Commission under paragraph (2), then the process by which military installations may be selected for closure or realignment under this part with respect to that year shall be terminated.

"(2) In determining whether the percentage specified in paragraph (1) is satisfied, the Commission shall calculate such percentage both in terms of—

"(A) the number of military installations outside the United States recommended for closure or realignment as a percentage of the total number of military installations recommended for closure or realignment that year; and

"(B) the number of military personnel and civilian employees of the Department of Defense stationed or employed outside the United States directly affected by the recommendations as a percentage of the total number of military personnel and civilian employees of the Department of Defense directly affected by the recommendations."

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Subsection (b) of section 2901 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Purpose.—The purpose of this part is to provide a fair process that will result in the timely closure and realignment of military installations inside and outside the United States."

(2) Section 2911 of such Act, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), is amended—

(A) in paragraph (4), by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "With respect to military operations carried out by the United States outside the United States, such term includes the sites and facilities at which such operations are carried out without regard to whether the sites and facilities are owned by the United States."; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(8) The terms 'closure' and 'realignment' include, with respect to military operations carried out by the United States outside the United States, the termination or reduction of such operations."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from

Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposing, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reserve the right to hold my time to close debate.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Colorado reserves her 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Schroeder amendment, and I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], a member of the committee.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Having had bases in my district go through the BRAC process in 1988, 1991 and 1993 I believe this amendment will do great harm to a process that works.

I oppose this amendment for several reasons.

First, the BRAC process was designed to bypass the politics that prevented Congress from closing a single domestic base during the 70's and the late 80's.

We could learn a lesson from the BRAC process. Since parochial interests have blocked base closure in the past and still block spending cuts today, I personally believe that a BRAC type procedure should be established to reduce spending and eliminate the deficit.

However, There is no political gridlock when it comes to closing foreign bases. The Pentagon has closed bases abroad with little or no rumblings in Congress.

Since 1990, BRAC has approved the closure or realignment of approximately 60 major facilities in the United States.

During that same time frame we have closed approximately 700 installations abroad. This is according to information provided to my office from the House Armed Services Committee. In this year alone 90 overseas base closures or realignments were announced as opposed to 32 at home approved by BRAC.

The third reason I am opposed to this amendment is that it would be a logistical nightmare to include foreign base closures in the domestic process. The domestic process includes visits to every major facility that makes it on the Secretary of Defense's list for closure or realignment.

It would be a logistical nightmare and inflate the cost of doing business to send a BRAC commissioner and several staff members abroad to visit every major foreign base on that list. These visits also include input from community leaders as to why their bases should not be closed.

The fourth reason I am opposed to this amendment is that if we incorporate foreign base closures into the domestic process that would mean, as I mentioned, meetings with community leaders.

As the process operates now, communities in the United States can make a case for having their bases removed from the closure list—and some are successful. Communities abroad cannot do this.

By voting for this amendment Congress could be providing a forum where foreign communities would be given equal status with American communities in trying to get their base removed from the list.

I know this is exactly the opposite of what the gentle lady from Colorado intended when she proposed this amendment.

For these reasons I urge my fellow colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY], a very respected Member and chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Colorado. This amendment would place the 1995 base closure round in jeopardy.

This amendment would grant the already overburdened Independent Base Closure and Realignment Commission the ability to recommend closure of foreign bases. Giving this Commission the ability to determine our country's national security arrangements overseas is an abrogation of the responsibilities of the executive branch and the oversight responsibilities of this Congress.

In addition, the amendment mandates the termination of the 1995 base closure round if the Commission's foreign closure recommendations do not constitute 25 percent of the total list. This requirement eliminates any possibility of achieving defense savings through a proper reduction in infrastructure costs that this Congress intended by the passage of the 1990 Base Closure Act.

Furthermore, it is conceivable that the Commission could be forced to include more domestic closures to satisfy this percentage requirement.

While this amendment makes for good bumper sticker politics, its effect runs counter to its good intentions. This House should not be in the business of handing over this country's national security arrangements to independent Commissions. There has already been a 42-percent reduction in

overseas infrastructure, with more closure announcements likely. This administration is living up to its pledge to ensure that taxpayer moneys are being spent wisely in our overseas locations. The recently released bottom-up review also spoke to the need to continue to reduce excess infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, Secretary of Defense Aspin has recently stated as of July that the total number of U.S. military sites overseas has been reduced by about 50 percent since January of 1990; 840 locations overseas were reduced or ended in the last 3 years, and of those, 773 are in Europe where the United States and its NATO allies no longer face the Moscow-Warsaw Pact.

There is also the intention to reduce U.S. forces there to 100,000 by September 30, 1996.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge a no vote on the Schroeder amendment.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining 15 seconds to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

□ 1330

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that in Europe we have drawn down from 304,000 to 164,000. The Subcommittee on MILCON will be working this extensively next year.

I say to my colleagues, "Please vote no on the Schroeder amendment."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). All time in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado for 5 minutes to close debate.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which would put overseas military bases on the 1995 base closure process, just like domestic bases. I urge you to vote yes on the amendment.

It is ludicrous that overseas bases have not been included in past base closure rounds. As we think our defense infrastructure at home, we should be doing the same with our bases overseas. In order to achieve this, the Pentagon needs the same push, as they now have with domestic bases, to make the hard choices of overseas base closures.

The Defense Department argues that it already has the ability to close overseas bases, and that it has closed hundreds of bases in recent years. These numbers may look impressive, but a closer look shows they are comparing apples with prunes: Domestic base closure lists close entire installations, overseas lists close sites—often unmanned, like radar towers, or with no military mission, like country clubs.

My amendment will treat overseas bases just like domestic bases during the 1995 base closure process. DOD will continue to make recommendations to

the Base Realignment and Closure Commission, which will analyze the choices and make final recommendations to the President and Congress. In order to make my amendment effective, 25 percent of the 1995 base closure list must include overseas bases, and if not, then the base closure process will terminate for that year.

The House passed a similar provision in 1991, by a vote of 412-14, during consideration of the 1991 base closure list. Mr. Chairman, I urge you and our colleagues to make a similar vote this week to make the 1995 base closure process a similar success.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to urge the House to support the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER]. It is a matter of fairness that foreign bases also be included in the base closure process which now includes only domestic bases. This does not infringe on the President's ability to conduct foreign affairs. If I were President, I would welcome an independent commission's evaluation of foreign bases and the military value which they contribute to the defense of this Nation. It would aid the President in explaining to some nations why such an action must be taken. If the President believed a foreign base was absolutely essential to the defense of the United States, his request would be surely accepted by those involved in the base closure process.

Earlier this year, several of us put in legislation to accomplish exactly what the gentlewoman from Colorado has offered today. H.R. 1321 had bipartisan support. I hope that this amendment will also have bipartisan support. I commend the gentlewoman from Colorado for offering it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 286, noes 137, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]

AYES—286

Abercrombie	Brewster	Clyburn
Ackerman	Brooks	Coleman
Allard	Browder	Collins (IL)
Andrews (ME)	Brown (CA)	Collins (MI)
Andrews (NJ)	Brown (FL)	Condit
Applegate	Brown (OH)	Cooper
Baessler	Bryant	Costello
Barca	Burton	Coyne
Barlow	Byrne	Cramer
Barrett (WI)	Callahan	Callahan
Bellenson	Calvert	Danner
Bentley	Camp	Darden
Bevill	Canady	de la Garza
Bilbray	Cantwell	de Lugo (VI)
Billrakis	Cardin	Deal
Bishop	Carr	DeFazio
Blackwell	Chapman	DeLauro
Boehlert	Clay	Dellums
Bonior	Clayton	Derrick
Borski	Clement	Deutsch
Boucher	Clinger	Dicks

Dingell	Klink	Regula
Dixon	Klug	Reynolds
Dooley	Kopetski	Richardson
Dreier	Kreidler	Ridge
Duncan	LaFalce	Roberts
Durbin	Lambert	Roemer
Edwards (CA)	Lantos	Rogers
Emerson	LaRocco	Rose
Engel	Leach	Rostenkowski
English (AZ)	Lehman	Roth
English (OK)	Levin	Roukema
Eshoo	Lewis (CA)	Rowland
Evans	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Faleomavaega	Lightfoot	Royce
(AS)	Lipinski	Rush
Farr	Long	Sabo
Fazio	Lowey	Sanders
Fields (LA)	Maloney	Sangmeister
Filner	Manton	Sarpalius
Fingerhut	Margolles	Sawyer
Flake	Mezvinsky	Schaefer
Foglietta	Markey	Schenk
Ford (MI)	Martinez	Schroeder
Frank (MA)	Matsui	Schumer
Franks (NJ)	Mazzoli	Scott
Frost	McCloskey	Sensenbrenner
Furse	McHale	Serrano
Gejdenson	McHugh	Sharp
Gephardt	McInnis	Shepherd
Gillmor	McKinney	Skaggs
Glickman	McNulty	Skelton
Gordon	Meehan	Slattery
Grandy	Meek	Slaughter
Green	Meyers	Snowe
Greenwood	Miller (CA)	Spratt
Gunderson	Miller (FL)	Stark
Gutierrez	Mineta	Stenholm
Hall (OH)	Minge	Strickland
Hall (TX)	Mink	Studds
Hamburg	Moakley	Stupak
Hansen	Montgomery	Sundquist
Harman	Moran	Swett
Hastert	Morella	Swift
Hastings	Murphy	Synar
Hayes	Myers	Tanner
Hefley	Nadler	Taylor (MS)
Hefner	Natcher	Taylor (NC)
Hilliard	Neal (MA)	Tejeda
Hinchee	Norton (DC)	Thompson
Hoagland	Oberstar	Thurman
Hobson	Obey	Torres
Hochbrueckner	Oliver	Towns
Holden	Ortiz	Trafigant
Horn	Orton	Tucker
Houghton	Owens	Underwood (GU)
Hoyer	Pallone	Unsoeld
Hughes	Parker	Upton
Inhofe	Pastor	Valentine
Inslee	Payne (NJ)	Velazquez
Istook	Payne (VA)	Vento
Jacobs	Pelosi	Volkmer
Jefferson	Penny	Walsh
Johnson (CT)	Peterson (FL)	Washington
Johnson (GA)	Peterson (MN)	Waters
Johnson (SD)	Petri	Watt
Johnston	Pickle	Waxman
Kanjorski	Pomeroy	Wheat
Kaptur	Portman	Williams
Kasich	Poshard	Wilson
Kennedy	Price (NC)	Wise
Kennelly	Quinn	Wolf
Kildee	Rahall	Woolsey
Klecza	Rangel	Wyden
Klein	Ravenel	Wynn
	Reed	Zimmer

NOES—137

Andrews (TX)	Bonilla	Everett
Archer	Bunning	Ewing
Armey	Buyer	Fawell
Bacchus (FL)	Castle	Fields (TX)
Bacchus (AL)	Coble	Fish
Baker (CA)	Collins (GA)	Fowler
Baker (LA)	Combest	Franks (CT)
Ballenger	Coppersmith	Galleghy
Barcia	Cox	Gallo
Barrett (NE)	Crapo	Gekas
Bartlett	Cunningham	Geren
Barton	DeLay	Gibbons
Bateman	Diaz-Balart	Gilchrest
Bereuter	Dickey	Gilman
Berman	Doolittle	Gingrich
Bliley	Dornan	Gonzalez
Blute	Dunn	Goodlatte
Boehner	Edwards (TX)	Goodling

Goss	Manzullo	Saxton
Grams	McCandless	Schiff
Hamilton	McCollum	Shaw
Hancock	McCrery	Shays
Herger	McCurdy	Shuster
Hoekstra	McDade	Siskisky
Huffington	McKeon	Skeen
Hunter	McMillan	Smith (IA)
Hutchinson	Menendez	Smith (MI)
Hutto	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Inglis	Michel	Smith (OR)
Johnson, Sam	Molinar	Smith (TX)
Kim	Mollohan	Solomon
King	Moorhead	Spence
Kingston	Murtha	Stearns
Knollenberg	Nussle	Stump
Kolbe	Oxley	Talent
Kyl	Packard	Thomas (CA)
Lancaster	Paxon	Thomas (WY)
Laughlin	Pickett	Thornton
Lazio	Pompo	Torkildsen
Levy	Porter	Torricelli
Lewis (FL)	Pryce (OH)	Visclosky
Linder	Quillen	Walker
Livingston	Ramstad	Weldon
Lloyd	Rohrabacher	Young (FL)
Machtley	Ros-Lehtinen	Zeliff
Mann	Santorum	

NOT VOTING—15

Becerra	Mfume	Vucanovich
Conyers	Neal (NC)	Whitten
Ford (TN)	Romero-Barcelo	Yates
Hoke	(PR)	Young (AK)
Hyde	Stokes	
McDermott	Tauzin	

□ 1353

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Stokes for, with Mrs. Vucanovich against.

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama and Mr. MENENDEZ changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. DUNCAN, TAYLOR of North Carolina, GILLMOR, CRAMER, and TEJEDA changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part 3 of House Report 103-223.

AMENDMENT AS MODIFIED OFFERED BY MRS.

LLOYD

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, as modified.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment, as modified.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. LLOYD, as modified: At the end of title X (page 346, after line 23), insert the following new sections:

SEC. 1043. SHARING DEFENSE BURDENS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Since fiscal year 1985, the budget of the Department of Defense has declined by 34 percent in real terms.

(2) During the past few years, the United States military presence overseas has declined significantly in the following ways:

(A) Since fiscal year 1986, the number of United States military personnel permanently stationed overseas has declined by almost 200,000 personnel.

(B) From fiscal year 1989 to fiscal year 1994, spending by the United States to support the stationing of United States military forces overseas will have declined by 36 percent.

(C) Since January 1990, the Department of Defense has announced the closure, reduction, or transfer to standby status of 840 United States military facilities overseas, which is approximately a 50 percent reduction in the number of such facilities.

(3) The United States military presence overseas will continue to decline as a result of actions by the executive branch and the following initiatives of the Congress:

(A) Section 1302 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993, which required a 40 percent reduction by September 30, 1996, in the number of United States military personnel permanently stationed ashore in overseas locations.

(B) Section 1303 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993, which specified that no more than 100,000 United States military personnel may be permanently stationed ashore in NATO member countries after September 30, 1996.

(C) Section 1301 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993, which reduced the spending proposed by the Department of Defense for overseas basing activities during fiscal year 1993 by \$500,000,000.

(D) Sections 913 and 915 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991, which directed the President to develop a plan to gradually reduce the United States military force structure in East Asia.

(4) The East Asia Strategy Initiative, which was developed in response to sections 913 and 915 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991, has resulted in the withdrawal of 12,000 United States military personnel from Japan and the Republic of Korea since fiscal year 1990.

(5) In response to actions by the executive branch and the Congress, allied countries in which United States military personnel are stationed and alliances in which the United States participates have agreed in the following ways to reduce the costs incurred by the United States in basing military forces overseas:

(A) Under the 1991 Special Measures Agreement between Japan and the United States, Japan will pay by 1995 almost all yen-denominated costs of stationing United States military personnel in Japan.

(B) The Republic of Korea has agreed to pay by 1995, one-third of the won-based costs incurred by the United States in stationing United States military personnel in the Republic of Korea.

(C) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has agreed that the NATO Infrastructure Program will adapt to support post-Cold War strategy and could pay the annual operation and maintenance costs of facilities in Europe and the United States that would support the reinforcement of Europe by United States military forces and the participation of United States military forces in peacekeeping and conflict prevention operations.

(D) Such allied countries and alliances have agreed to more fully share the responsibilities and burdens of providing for mutual security and stability through steps such as the following:

(i) The Republic of Korea has assumed the leadership role regarding ground combat forces for the defense of the Republic of Korea.

(ii) NATO has adopted the new mission of conducting peacekeeping operations and is,

for example, providing land, sea, and air forces for United Nations efforts in the former Yugoslavia.

(iii) The countries of western Europe are contributing substantially to the development of democracy, stability, and open market societies in eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the forward presence of United States military personnel stationed overseas continues to be important to United States security interests;

(2) that forward presence facilitates efforts to pursue United States security interests on a collective basis rather than pursuing them on a far more costly unilateral basis or receding into isolationism;

(3) the bilateral and multilateral arrangements and alliances in which that forward presence plays a part must be further adapted to the security environment of the post-Cold War period;

(4) the cost-sharing percentages for the NATO Infrastructure Program should be reviewed with the aim of reflecting current economic, political, and military realities and thus reducing the United States cost-sharing percentage; and

(5) the amounts obligated to conduct United States overseas basing activities should decline significantly in fiscal year 1994 and in future fiscal years as—

(A) the number of United States military personnel stationed overseas continues to decline; and

(B) the countries in which United States military personnel are stationed and the alliances in which the United States participates assume an increased share of United States overseas basing costs.

(c) REDUCING UNITED STATES OVERSEAS BASING COSTS.—(1) In order to achieve additional savings in overseas basing costs, the President should—

(A) continue with the reductions in United States military presence overseas as required by sections 1302 and 1303 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993; and

(B) intensify his efforts to negotiate a more favorable host-nation agreement with each foreign country to which this paragraph applies under paragraph (3)(A).

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), a more favorable host-nation agreement is an agreement under which such foreign country—

(A) assumes an increased share of the costs of United States military installations in that country, including the costs of—

(i) labor, utilities, and services;

(ii) military construction projects and real property maintenance;

(iii) leasing requirements associated with the United States military presence; and

(iv) actions necessary to meet local environmental standards;

(B) relieves the Armed Forces of the United States of all tax liability that, with respect to forces located in such country, is incurred by the Armed Forces under the laws of that country and the laws of the community where those forces are located; and

(C) ensures that goods and services furnished in that country to the Armed Forces of the United States are provided at minimum cost and without imposition of user fees.

(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), paragraph (1)(B) applies with respect to—

(i) each country of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (other than the United States); and

(ii) each other foreign country with which the United States has a bilateral or multilateral defense agreement that provides for the assignment of combat units of the Armed Forces of the United States to permanent duty in that country or the placement of combat equipment of the United States in that country.

(B) Paragraph (1) does not apply with respect to—

(1) a foreign country that receives assistance under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2673) (relating to the foreign military financing program) or under the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.); or

(ii) a foreign country that has agreed to assume, not later than September 30, 1996, at least 75 percent of the nonpersonnel costs of United States military installations in the country.

(d) OBLIGATIONAL LIMITATION.—(1) The total amount appropriated to the Department of Defense for Military Personnel, for Operation and Maintenance, and for military construction (including NATO Infrastructure) that is obligated to conduct overseas basing activities during fiscal year 1994 may not exceed \$16,915,400,000 (such amount being the amount appropriated for such purposes for fiscal year 1993 reduced by \$3,300,000,000).

(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term "overseas basing activities" means the activities of the Department of Defense for which funds are provided through appropriations for Military Personnel, for Operation and Maintenance (including appropriations for family housing operations), and for military construction (including family housing construction and NATO Infrastructure) for the payment of costs for Department of Defense overseas military units and the costs for all dependents who accompany Department of Defense personnel outside the United States.

(e) ALLOCATIONS OF SAVINGS.—Any amounts appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1994 for the purposes covered by subsection (d)(1) that are not available to be used for those purposes by reason of the limitation in that subsection shall be allocated by the Secretary of Defense for operation and maintenance and for military construction activities of the Department of Defense at military installations and facilities located inside the United States.

SEC. 1044. BURDENSARING CONTRIBUTIONS FROM DESIGNATED COUNTRIES AND REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1045 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102-190; 105 Stat. 1465) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking out "During fiscal years 1992 and 1993, the Secretary" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary"; and

(B) by striking out "Japan, Kuwait, and the Republic of Korea" and inserting in lieu thereof "any country or regional organization designated for purposes of this section by the Secretary of Defense"; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking out "each quarter of fiscal years 1992 and 1993" and inserting in lieu thereof "each fiscal-year quarter";

(B) by striking out "congressional defense committees" and inserting in lieu thereof "Congress"; and

(C) by striking out "Japan, Kuwait, and the Republic of Korea" and inserting in lieu

thereof "each country and regional organization from which contributions have been accepted by the Secretary under subsection (a)".

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1045. BURDENSARING CONTRIBUTIONS FROM DESIGNATED COUNTRIES AND REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS."

SEC. 1045. MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN REPORT REQUIREMENTS.

(a) BIENNIAL NATO REPORT.—Section 1002(d) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-525; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), is amended—

(1) by striking out "(1) Not later than April 1, 1990, and biennially each year thereafter" and inserting in lieu thereof "Not later than April 1 of each even-numbered year";

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (1) and (2); and

(3) by striking out paragraph (2) (following the paragraph (2) designated by paragraph (2) of this subsection).

(b) REPORT ON ALLIED CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 1046(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102-190; 105 Stat. 1467; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) specifying the incremental costs to the United States associated with the permanent stationing ashore of United States forces in foreign nations."

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—(1) The Congress finds that the Secretary of Defense did not submit to Congress in a timely manner the report on allied contributions to the common defense required under section 1003 of the National Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-525; 98 Stat. 2577), to be submitted not later than April 1, 1993.

(2) It is the sense of Congress that the timely submission of such report to Congress each year is essential to the deliberation by Congress concerning the annual defense program.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD].

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I will offer an amendment, along with my cosponsor, Mr. SISISKY, in an effort to provide the House with a responsible approach to the oversight of U.S. military basing activities overseas. And, frankly, Mr. Chairman, we offer this amendment to help counter and deflect less responsible amendments that would cut too deeply into the ability of the United States to secure its own vital national interests overseas.

Mr. Chairman, it is long past time for this body to place the burdensharing debate where it belongs—solidly on the grounds of securing our own national interests. Every Member of this body should certainly understand that we do

not have troops in Japan primarily to defend Japan. We do not have troops in Korea primarily to defend Korea. We do not have troops in Europe primarily to defend Europe. The Armed Services Committee and the administration, like past Congresses and administrations, have judged that vital U.S. national interests are at stake overseas and that forward military presence is vital to securing those interests. The United States must be willing to bear the responsibilities and burdens associated with securing its interests and should insist that its allies share those responsibilities and burdens to the extent that their interests are also being secured.

This amendment recognizes the importance of forward military presence to securing U.S. national interests and would provide adequate support for maintaining that presence. It also recognizes that such forward presence costs us far less in the long run—it helps us pursue our own national security interests on a collective basis rather than pursuing them on a far more costly unilateral basis or ignoring them altogether and retreating into isolationism.

Our amendment takes into account the great strides that have been made in implementing recent congressional mandates regarding overseas basing activities and allied commitments to sharing more equitably the responsibilities and burdens associated with our mutual security. For example, since 1986, the number of U.S. military personnel permanently stationed overseas has declined by almost 200,000; Since 1989, U.S. spending for overseas basing activities has fallen by more than 36 percent; the total number of U.S. military facilities overseas has been reduced by about 50 percent and we are cutting bases overseas more quickly than domestic bases.

Let us take a look at the progress we are making as a result of last year's congressional mandates alone. First, as a result of the amendment offered last year by Mrs. SCHROEDER, we are withdrawing our troops from Europe so as to have no more than 100,000 there by 1996. Also by 1996, Mr. GEPHARDT's amendment from last year is reducing our total overseas forces to 60 percent of the 1992 level. The amendments of Mr. FRANK and Mr. KASICH resulted in the reduction of \$500 million in U.S. overseas military spending. The amendment we are offering here would provide a capstone to these congressional actions with the net result of bringing U.S. military spending for 1994 down to about \$3.3 billion lower than in 1993.

Mr. Chairman, our allies have also taken significant steps in the direction of more equitably sharing the responsibilities and burdens associated with mutual security and stability. Japan, for example, currently contributes

roughly \$3 billion per year against United States stationing costs and has agreed to pay virtually all such costs by 1995 except those, such as salaries, that would not be appropriate. South Korea currently contributes roughly \$2 billion per year against United States stationing costs, has agreed to pay substantially more by 1995, provides manpower augmentees to United States Army units in Korea, and has assumed leadership of the ground forces deployed in that country. Germany hosts the largest concentration of United States forces overseas, provides by far the greatest reductions and offsets of United States stationing costs, and contributes far more than any other country (including the United States) to the reconstruction, democratization and economic reform of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union (including about 75 percent of all grant aid to the former Soviet Union).

Our NATO allies have also agreed to act collectively to help reduce U.S. stationing costs. NATO has approved the use of common funding (to which our allies contribute about 72 percent) to pay for embarkation facilities on the East Coast of North America and to extend eligibility for such common funding to U.S. O&M costs at reinforcement facilities such as air bases and the storage sites for prepositioned U.S. equipment and ammunition.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am cosponsoring today takes into account this significant progress we have made in reducing the U.S. costs of maintaining the forward military presence we need to secure our own national interests. Our amendment takes an important additional step as well. It proposes a reduction in our total overseas O&M spending of about \$580 million below the level recommended in the committee bill. We are making this proposal primarily in anticipation of continued U.S. troop withdrawals from overseas bases somewhat ahead of the schedules on which the Pentagon's budget proposal was based. Because these withdrawn troops will be arriving at their new U.S. bases somewhat ahead of schedule, and neither the administration nor the Congress are recommending that they be ushered out of the force, our amendment would apply these savings in overseas costs to the increased readiness requirements at our bases here at home.

Furthermore, our amendment includes a sense of Congress that our security arrangements and alliances must be further adapted to the security environment of the post-cold war period. For example, NATO should continue developing its peacekeeping capabilities and embracing former adversaries in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Our amendment also insists that NATO review the cost-sharing percentages of its infrastructure program and conform them to current economic, military and political

realities. Finally, our amendment insists that the President continue the reductions in our overseas military presence mandated by Congress and intensify his efforts to secure further agreements with our allies that bring additional reductions in our overseas basing costs.

Mr. Chairman, our amendment proposes a responsible approach to congressional oversight of overseas basing requirements and should be supported by both sides of the aisle. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this Lloyd/Sisisky amendment. I urge them to vote no on the Frank Amendment that is to follow.

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LLOYD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, I hope Members listen to what the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD] is saying and support this amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY], instead of the one that follows.

Mr. Chairman, we all know we are drawing down in Europe at a big rate, but we do not want to pull the rug out from under our troops there. This is a reasonable course. I know that this is the operations and maintenance fund. Of course, under this amendment if they get in trouble with our maintenance and operations funding they can reprogram and make sure that our forces overseas have what they need.

Mr. Chairman, it is hard enough, it is difficult enough for our forces. Many of them are being discharged in mid-career. So I think the Members would be wise in supporting this amendment and voting no on the amendment to follow this.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO] for his leadership, and also for his support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an excellent way of approaching this, because the \$580 million that is going from one place to the other is sorely needed.

□ 1400

And if we do not need it in one place, we certainly do in the other, particularly in the O&M area.

I congratulate the gentlewoman and compliment her and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY] on what they are doing.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his leadership and his willingness to increase our readiness capability here at home.

It is important to remember that our amendment also includes a sense of Congress that our security arrangements and our alliances must be adapted further to the security environment of the post-cold war world. I do hope that my colleagues will support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, for many years we have debated the proper level of funding for U.S. forces overseas, and the pace of troop withdrawals as we reduce our overseas presence.

At first these were considered in the context of their impact on our military capabilities and on U.S. influence in other regions.

However, these issues are now being considered in the context of their impact on the economy, or the amount of funding they could free up for economic conversion.

I think we need to go back and address these issues in the larger context of our role in the world.

In my opinion, there is no substitute for being there. We must maintain our day-to-day presence and influence overseas.

I doubt anyone would disagree. But as a practical matter, some of these amendments have that effect.

Using this money for deficit reduction or economic conversion sounds appealing—especially in a district like mine.

But the world is still a very dangerous place.

None of these amendments give us enough flexibility to meet the uncertain challenge of the future.

Yesterday I entered into the RECORD a letter from Secretary Aspin and Secretary Christopher.

They say,

It is our assessment that our burdensharing negotiations with major European allies will not conceivably yield the contributions called for by these proposals.

As a result, these amendments would force the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe, and with them would go our leadership position in European affairs, and our ability to promote vital national interests.

The proposed amendments run contrary to U.S. interests and portend disastrous consequences.

But there is a way to move in this direction—without going too far—by supporting the Lloyd/Sisisky amendment.

Our amendment anticipates overseas troop reductions of 40 percent by fiscal year 1996, which I think is realistic.

In line with this, we reduce O&M funds for overseas commitments by \$580 million in fiscal year 1994.

Our amendment does not go too far or too fast—and gets us where we want to go in a prudent, steady, responsible manner.

Just as important, it does not burn our bridges behind us.

We can continue to assess the situation as the need arises.

I ask you to support the Lloyd/Sisisky amendment—while opposing amendments that go too far, too fast in what could be a wrong and very risky direction.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment being offered by our colleagues on the committee. This is a responsible approach to burdensharing.

For all of our colleagues who are back in their offices or here in the Chamber, if they want to vote for a reasonable, responsible approach to burdensharing, to give the administration a signal that this is a top priority but not undermine this administration's attempt to deal with our allies in a responsible manner, this is the vote.

Republicans will be joining our Democratic colleagues in support of this amendment. I also ask our colleagues, both in their offices and here on the floor, to overwhelmingly reject the following amendment, which I think is irresponsible, which the administration has gone on record, both Warren Christopher and Les Aspin, in saying it would jeopardize their ability to have a reasonable relationship with our NATO allies and would undo the good will that we have established over the years in working to downsize our European forces.

In fact, when that amendment is offered, I am going to ask unanimous consent to amend it to instead of taking the \$1 billion from our European allies to ask that that amendment take the \$1 billion from the U.N. to pay for the Somalia operation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, 2 minutes, to the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD].

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding time to me.

I ask my colleagues to support my amendment and reject the Frank amendment. The Frank amendment, if enacted into law, would force the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe. With them would go the leadership position in European affairs and our ability to promote and to protect our vital national interests there.

With continued U.S. involvement and leadership, we can marshal NATO's collective political, diplomatic, social, economic and military capabilities to pursue our mutual interests in stability and security. Americans don't want and can't afford to go it alone and play the world's policeman. Neither can we

(B) \$40,000,000 shall be used to increase funding for community adjustment and economic diversification assistance under section 2391(b) of title 10, United States Code;

(C) \$60,000,000 shall be used to increase funding for the teacher and teacher's aide placement programs under section 1151 of title 10, United States Code;

(D) \$60,000,000 shall be used to increase funding for the law enforcement placement program under section 1152 of title 10, United States Code, and the health care provider placement program under section 1153 of such title, as added by section 1332;

(E) \$10,000,000 shall be used to increase funding for the program to provide demonstration grants to institutions of higher education to provide education and training in environmental restoration to dislocated defense workers and young adults, as established by section 1333;

(F) \$10,000,000 shall be used to increase funding for the demonstration program for the training of recently discharged veterans for employment in construction and in hazardous waste remediation, as established by section 1335; and

(G) \$20,000,000 shall be used to increase funding for the Service Members Occupational Conversion and Training Act of 1992 (subchapter G of title XLIV of Public Law 102-484; 106 Stat. 2768).

(e) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the President should continue efforts to enter into revised host-nation agreements as described in section 1301(e) of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484; 106 Stat. 2545) for purposes of providing that foreign countries assume an increased share of the costs of United States military installations in those countries, and for the other purposes set forth in paragraph (2) of that section; and

(2) each host-nation agreement entered into pursuant to such section should require the host nation to increase its payments under the agreement at an annual rate of not less than 15 percent per year so that the host nation assumes, not later than September 30, 1998, at least 75 percent of the non-personnel costs of United States military installations in that nation.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], the gentleman from Connecticut, [Mr. SHAYS], and myself, to require increased burdensharing contributions from our allies.

I want to focus on one part of the amendment, which would encourage the President to enter into agreements with foreign allies to engage in joint training at allied bases—bases paid for and maintained by our foreign friends.

This amendment would encourage dual basing—keeping U.S. troops permanently stationed in the United States while maintaining training relationships with foreign countries. By

using short-term deployments, military members can avoid being stationed overseas, away from their families and familiar culture.

We want to continue to have a foreign presence, but not at the expense of maintaining a costly network of infrastructure overseas. Allies who are able to host our training exercises with their own troops should benefit from U.S. presence.

Many of our allies believe that the United States will never reduce permanently stationed presence in their country. This amendment sends the clear signal that we don't intend to stay permanently, but will be happy to work with them if they are willing to pay a fair share of training costs—the cost of maintaining the base infrastructure in their country.

The Frank-Schroeder-Shays amendment will give U.S. negotiators the leverage they need to strike fair and effective agreements with our allies. We have seen the progress we have made in recent years in Asia, due in large part to amendments adopted by the Congress. The Frank-Schroeder-Shays amendment will carry on that tradition and improve our relationships with our allies around the world. Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the amendment.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities.

Mr. HUNTER. My colleagues, this is a bad amendment because it does the worst disservice one can possibly do to our troops. It cuts maintenance, it cuts operations, and that means ammunition, it means spare parts, it means quality of life things like repairing barracks and repairing residence for military families overseas. The worst thing we can do when we have military people overseas is to leave them in a state of unreadiness.

We are reducing our troops in Europe. We have gone down almost 50 percent. Take a look here and see that we are down about 150,000 people since 1990. That is a sharp rate of reduction. It is a much steeper slope than our own base closure program at home.

Do not vote "yes" on the Frank amendment. It deprives our troops, your troops, of ammunition, of spare parts, of readiness, and that is a great disservice. Vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, while the United States and the Soviet Union were involved in a cold war, Europe, Japan, and the Asian rim nations were involved in an economic contest and dividing the spoils. And they were doing that for decades. Now finally we

have a chance to be involved in this economic contest and create jobs here at home.

But it is difficult when we still continue to subsidize Western Europe and to some extent Japan and Korea. I wonder, as I think about burden sharing, why the Japanese pay 68 percent of the nonpersonnel costs and give us \$2.5 billion in cash, and Europe pays only 19 percent of the nonpersonnel costs and what's worse only \$299 million in cash.

□ 1430

I wonder why that happens. The answer is obvious: We let them get away with it. We let them have a free ride. We passed an amendment last year that said they should pay 75 percent of our nonpersonnel costs by 1996. That is about \$4.5 billion. They are way behind schedule.

The Frank-Shays-Schroeder amendment gets them back on schedule. It honors the amendment we passed last year.

I urge you to vote for this \$1 billion reduction to our overseas basing account. Half of this money will go for deficit reduction and the other half helps get our troops and our businesses back competing with Western Europe, Japan, and the rest of the world economically.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, for all of our colleagues who voted for the previous amendment, which was, in my opinion, a responsible approach to burden sharing, I would ask that they not support this amendment which the administration is unalterably opposed to. Any of my colleagues, on either side, who has the opportunity to read the letter from Secretary of State Warren Christopher and Secretary of Defense Les Aspin, which states in very dramatic terms what this amendment would do to our relationship with our NATO allies, understands that this is not the most prudent course to take in terms of supporting this administration and its foreign policy objectives.

I would say to the authors of this amendment, ask them a question: If they would be willing to amend this amendment and take the \$1 billion that they want to save, from the Somalia operation, I will support it. Would the gentleman be willing to accept that?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would accept that as a separate amendment. I think adding it to this one could endanger it. But if the gentleman wants to offer that as a separate amendment, we can deal with that if he asks and gets unanimous consent. But I do not want to burden it any more than he wanted to add it to

the last amendment. He did not want to add it.

Mr. WELDON. If the gentleman would accept that amendment, I would be happy to change it to pay for it—have the U.N. pay for it from the funds for the Somalia operation and we could save \$1 billion out of our defense budget this year and next. Obviously, my colleague does not want to accept it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARCA].

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have watched attentively the last couple of days for the cries to cut spending first which have been echoed through this Chamber just 1 month ago being drowned out by a kind of missile mania. If we will not cut unnecessary spending, at least we can ask our allies, who have racked up foreign trade surpluses at our expense, to pay their fair share. We are not promoting isolationism, we are still willing to make the sacrifices to put our young men and women in the guardposts at the front lines. But our allies must share the financial burden. We simply cannot afford to continue this practice.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Frank amendment that would take \$1 billion away from the support of our men and women stationed in Europe to secure our own national interests.

I would like to remind my colleagues that our troops in Europe have not been maintained by administration after administration and Congress after Congress to protect our Nation's security interests alone. They have been maintained there to secure our economic interests as well. We can not afford to lose sight of the fact that Europe is already our Nation's largest economic market, even before you add the 400 million people of Central Europe and the former Soviet Union. Stability throughout that region is vital to securing economic development and opportunities for American commerce.

And, let me add here that, if any organization stands a chance of providing the necessary stability to that region, it is NATO. I'll go a step further and say that, if the United States had exercised its leadership in NATO and encouraged that alliance to join in taking even modest action in the former Yugoslavia in 1991 and 1992, that region would be a lot further from war and a lot closer to a stable market in 1993.

Mr. Chairman, we should see this amendment for what it is and not what it pretends to be. It is an attempt to reduce our military presence in Europe drastically below the levels mandated by Congress and proposed by the administration. Such reductions would eliminate the capabilities on which active U.S. participation and leadership

in NATO are based. Isn't it strange and disturbing that some Americans and their representatives are clamoring to get America out of NATO at a time when the countries of Central Europe and the former Soviet Union are clamoring to get into NATO.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment also ignores the vital link between stability and economic opportunity by pretending that we could effectively reduce our budget deficit and enhance our defense conversion programs by reducing our security activities in Europe by a billion dollars. The foolhardiness of this approach is clear in President Clinton's statement that "We can not choose between international engagement and domestic reconstruction. They are two sides of the same coin. Our economy is increasingly tied to the world market."

Mr. Chairman, let me briefly lay out the consequences of this amendment in terms of our military presence in Europe and our overall force structure. First, the administration's projection, in conformance with last year's Schroeder amendment to reduce to 100,000 in Europe by 1996, is that our troop levels in Europe during 1994 would move from about 165,000 to about 135,000 and would cost us about \$10.5 billion. Those troops would be operating at high operational tempo levels to train with our allies and maintain their combat effectiveness in the missions for which they are preparing.

Given that our estimates of the incremental costs of maintaining troops in Europe compared to basing them in the United States are only about 10 to 15 percent, if the Frank amendment were to be enacted, we would be forced into one of two options. First, we could withdraw all of our troops from Europe in 1994 and station them in the United States in order to save the incremental costs of \$1 to \$1.5 billion. Second, we could cut our European deployments to a very low level in 1994—the highest estimate is 50,000 troops operating at very low optempo levels—and bring the remaining 85,000 or more back home and put them out of uniform and on the street. Neither of these options would protect our national security or economic interests in Europe, effectively reduce the budget deficit, or enhance our defense conversion prospects.

Mr. Chairman, I won't rehearse here the significant progress being made in reducing our overseas basing activities to Congressional mandated levels and in securing allied commitments to sharing equitably in the responsibilities and burdens of security and stability. I will simply remind my colleagues that NATO is the most successful security organization the world has ever known. It was instrumental in deterring world war III and ending the cold war without major bloodshed in Europe. It offers the primary hope for building on that success and securing

our national interests on a collective basis. We can't afford to do it otherwise—to play the world's policeman unilaterally or to retreat into isolationism. We have to maintain the necessary forward presence to avoid those outcomes. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Frank amendment.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISISKY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to say that this is an isolationistic amendment. We are wanted in Europe, we have been important in Europe, we are reducing our size from 390,000 to 100,000. Our presence promotes stability. Twice this century this country has had to go over to Europe to bail it out. That is why it is important to stay the course, do what we have to do; we are reducing and we are saving.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Frank amendment.

Mr. Chairman, today's Washington Post headlines, "Brothers in Arms Now, GI Joe and Ivan Train Together. American and Russian divisions to train together for peacekeeping operations." There is a picture of the Russian defense minister and Defense Secretary Les Aspin signing the documents together. It is in today's Post.

Vote for Frank.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the one thing you can be sure of, when a Secretary of Defense is shaking hands with any European defense minister, nobody is leaving any bucks in his palm.

I have an amendment here that is going to make Western Europe feel safer. It is an amendment to increase the security level of our allies because, contrary to almost everything that you have heard from the other side, a well-intentioned set of errors, I am sure, this does not mandate the reduction of anything. It has an option. It says we will save a billion from spending American dollars in Western Europe, but the money can come from one of two ways. One way is for the Western Europeans to give us an additional billion dollars. As the gentleman from Connecticut says, they give us a pitance now. Western Europeans tell us they feel very insecure and need American troops. So we say, "Okay. You give a billion dollars," not a lot of money for an entity larger, wealthier in total than us, "give the American taxpayers a billion dollars and we will leave the troops there." Do you know

what they are going to say? All of a sudden they will not feel so unsafe. All of a sudden they will not need the troops.

This does not produce ammunition, this does not even mandate pulling troops out. It does, if they do not want them. If the Western Europeans are not willing to pay even less than the Japanese pay for those troops to defend them against absolutely nothing—but then that is stupid. You ask them if they want them there. And of course they do. Why should they not want American troops spending American tax dollars, stimulating their economies?

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. No.

The fact is that we are subsidizing the economies of Western Europe. We simply say in this amendment, "If you want the current troop presence, if you feel unsafe, give us a billion dollars; if not, we will reduce our troops or equipment, troops or equipment."

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. No.

We will bring some home—the fact is the gentleman does not want to hear this argument, I understand that. The gentleman simply wants to harass me because he does not think that the accurate argument will work well.

□ 1440

The fact is that the representation was inaccurate. This simply says if Europe is not going to give us another billion dollars, we will reduce it by a billion dollars worth.

It is more moderate than the Bryant amendment. It is the only way to help the American taxpayer.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. REYNOLDS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 216, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 420]

AYES—210

Abercrombie	Boehlert	Coleman
Allard	Bonilla	Collins (IL)
Andrews (ME)	Bonior	Collins (MI)
Andrews (NJ)	Borski	Condit
Applegate	Brown (CA)	Cooper
Barca	Brown (OH)	Costello
Barcia	Bryant	Coyne
Barlow	Byrne	Crane
Barrett (WI)	Cantwell	Danner
Becerra	Cardin	de Lugo (VI)
Bellenson	Carr	DeFazio
Berman	Clay	DeLauro
Bishop	Clayton	Dellums
Blackwell	Clement	Derrick
Blute	Clyburn	Deutsch

Dingell	LaFalce	Romero-Barcelo
Dooley	Lambert	(PR)
Duncan	Lantos	Rostenkowski
Durbin	Leach	Roth
Edwards (CA)	Lehman	Roukema
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard
English (AZ)	Lightfoot	Royce
Eshoo	Lipinski	Rush
Evans	Long	Sabo
Farr	Lowey	Sanders
Fazio	Maloney	Sangmeister
Fields (LA)	Manton	Schenk
Filner	Margolies-	Schroeder
Fingerhut	Mezvinsky	Schumer
Foglietta	Markey	Scott
Ford (MI)	Martinez	Sensenbrenner
Ford (TN)	Mazzoli	Serrano
Frank (MA)	McCloskey	Sharp
Franks (NJ)	McHale	Shays
Frost	McKinney	Shepherd
Furse	McNulty	Slaughter
Gedjenson	Meehan	Snowe
Gephardt	Menendez	Stark
Grandy	Mfume	Strickland
Green	Miller (CA)	Studds
Gutierrez	Minge	Stupak
Hall (OH)	Mink	Swett
Hall (TX)	Moakley	Swift
Hamburg	Moran	Synar
Harman	Morella	Tanner
Hastings	Murphy	Tauzin
Hayes	Nadler	Thompson
Hilliard	Neal (MA)	Thurman
Hinchey	Norton (DC)	Torres
Hochbrueckner	Nussle	Torricelli
Holden	Oberstar	Towns
Horn	Obey	Trafficant
Hughes	Olver	Tucker
Inslee	Owens	Underwood (GU)
Istook	Pallone	Unsoeld
Jacobs	Pastor	Upton
Jefferson	Payne (NJ)	Velazquez
Johnson (CT)	Pelosi	Vento
Johnson (SD)	Penny	Volkmmer
Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)	Washington
Johnston	Petri	Waters
Kanjorski	Pomeroy	Watt
Kaptur	Porter	Waxman
Kennedy	Poshard	Wheat
Kennelly	Rahall	Williams
Kildee	Ramstad	Wise
Kim	Rangel	Woolsey
Klein	Reed	Wyden
Klink	Reynolds	Wynn
Kopetski	Roemer	Zimmer
Kreidler	Rohrabacher	

NOES—216

Ackerman	Combest	Gingrich
Andrews (TX)	Coppersmith	Glickman
Archer	Cox	Gonzalez
Armey	Cramer	Goodlatte
Bacchus (FL)	Crapo	Goodling
Bacchus (AL)	Cunningham	Gooding
Baerles	Darden	Gordon
Baker (CA)	de la Garza	Goss
Baker (LA)	Deal	Grams
Ballenger	DeLay	Greenwood
Barrett (NE)	Diaz-Balart	Gunderson
Bartlett	Dickey	Hamilton
Barton	Dicks	Hancock
Bateman	Dixon	Hansen
Bentley	Doolittle	Hastert
Bereuter	Dornan	Hefley
Beverly	Dreier	Hefner
Bilbray	Dunn	Herger
Billakis	Edwards (TX)	Hoagland
Bliley	Emerson	Hobson
Boehner	English (OK)	Hoekstra
Brewster	Everett	Houghton
Brooks	Ewing	Hoyer
Browder	Fawell	Huffington
Brown (FL)	Fields (TX)	Hunter
Bunning	Fish	Hutchinson
Burton	Flake	Hutto
Buyer	Fowler	Inglis
Callahan	Franks (CT)	Inhofe
Calvert	Galleghy	Johnson (GA)
Camp	Gallo	Johnson, Sam
Canady	Gekas	Kasich
Castle	Geran	King
Chapman	Gibbons	Kingston
Clinger	Gilchrest	Klecicka
Coble	Gillmor	Klug
Collins (GA)	Gilman	Knollenberg
		Kolbe

Kyl	Murtha	Shuster
Lancaster	Myers	Sisisky
LaRocco	Natcher	Skaggs
Laughlin	Ortiz	Skeen
Lazio	Orton	Skelton
Levin	Oxley	Slattery
Levy	Packard	Smith (IA)
Lewis (CA)	Parker	Smith (MI)
Lewis (FL)	Paxon	Smith (NJ)
Linder	Payne (VA)	Smith (OR)
Livingston	Peterson (FL)	Smith (TX)
Lloyd	Pickett	Solomon
Machtley	Pickle	Spence
Mann	Pombo	Spratt
Manzullo	Portman	Stearns
Matsul	Price (NC)	Stenholm
McCandless	Pryce (OH)	Stump
McCollum	Quillen	Sundquist
McCrery	Quinn	Talent
McCurdy	Ravenel	Taylor (MS)
McDade	Regula	Taylor (NC)
McHugh	Richardson	Tejeda
McInnis	Ridge	Thomas (CA)
McKeon	Roberts	Thomas (WY)
McMillan	Rogers	Thornton
Meek	Ros-Lehtinen	Torkildsen
Meyers	Rose	Valentine
Mica	Rowland	Visclosky
Michel	Santorum	Walker
Miller (FL)	Sarpalius	Walsh
Mineta	Sawyer	Weldon
Mollinari	Saxton	Wilson
Mollohan	Schaefer	Wolf
Montgomery	Schiff	Young (FL)
Moorhead	Shaw	Zeliff

NOT VOTING—12

Boucher	Hyde	Whitten
Conyers	McDermott	Yates
Faleomavaega	Neal (NC)	Young (AK)
(AS)	Stokes	
Hoke	Vucanovich	

□ 1500

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Stokes for, with Mrs. Vucanovich against.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BARCIA of Michigan changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ECONOMIC CONVERSION

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. REYNOLDS). It is now in order to debate the subject matter of economic conversion.

The gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] will be recognized for 15 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, we now enter the general debate on one of the most important areas I think this country faces, and that is the area of conversion.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to start by yielding 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who is the one that has had the greatest vision of all and been a terrific leader on this issue.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the defense conversion

title of H.R. 2401, Department of Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994.

Our efforts in crafting the defense conversion title in this year's bill is, I hope, a first step in support of the President in establishing a truly national economic conversion strategy. For too long, we have relied upon military technology and industrial production to keep our Nation on the cutting edge of technology. While military security is vital, we must now turn to the broader task of economic security demanded both at home and in the global marketplace. In pursuit of this economic security we have neither a person nor any resource, including those of DOD, to waste.

However, despite the economic threat that looms before us as a nation, it is interesting that there are some in this body who still sincerely believe that defense conversion cannot work and should not be vigorously pursued as part of a larger national economic strategy to lift all of our people toward a higher standard of living. I want to commend our distinguished friend and colleague, Congresswoman SCHROEDER, for her leadership and diligence in her work in support of defense conversion. Importantly, I want to thank all of the chairs of the committees with whom we worked to make certain that we could put the defense conversion title in the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, the case for defense economic conversion is compelling. It is not a social experiment with defense resources. It is an economic security necessity. Defense conversion now describes a larger and more ambitious process involving the redeployment of human and technology resources to strengthen our Nation economically in the larger process of economic conversion. It involves support for the diversification of defense contractors so they can remain economically viable. It now requires the integration of civilian and military industrial bases so DOD can obtain quality products made in this country at affordable prices so our defense needs are met in the future. In short, Mr. Chairman, defense conversion is no longer an option; it is an essential part of overall national economic strategy now and in the future.

Mr. Chairman, time permitting, I could go on. As I have said in the past defense conversion is an issue in which there are as yet probably no real experts. However, I hope all of us can begin and continue to work together in the future to make certain the benefits of defense economic conversion are shared by all Americans. I urge strong support of the committee's defense conversion title and amendments to strengthen the defense conversion program.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South

Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the distinguished ranking Republican.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, rising out of the political and economic turmoil caused by the defense drawdown, defense conversion has emerged for some as the political solution of choice to the many problems caused by continuing defense reductions.

The rush to embrace defense conversion as a viable solution over the past few years has been remarkable both for its level of enthusiasm as well as for the lack of hard information and study on whether it will ever work.

More than a year after Congress gave birth to the current conversion program, it remains an unfocused and ill-defined concept that regularly changes shape, size, and characteristics as political requirements dictate.

This lack of a coherent definition of defense conversion stems from the fact that it has come to mean too many things to too many people. For some, it is the means to turn swords into plowshares, literally converting defense capabilities to civilian, commercial uses.

For others, it is an opportunity to leverage defense dollars to promote civilian, nondefense objectives, such as spending defense dollars on commercial technology and education programs with little or no return on investment for the Department of Defense.

Others, myself included, believe that any meaningful conversion program should focus on ensuring the preservation of key defense industrial and technology capabilities during this post-cold war drawdown.

The program currently called conversion was developed by Congress during last year's election-year defense debate. No consensus was developed around a definition of what conversion was or should be. For some members, many ongoing defense technology programs somehow fit a liberal definition of conversion and were labelled accordingly.

Others dreamed up new programs to assist workers and communities or to encourage defense companies to develop dual-use technologies. Still others sought to transfer defense dollars to non-defense civilian agencies to pay for job retraining and economic development.

The result was today's grab-bag of unfocused conversion programs covering the spectrum from job retraining to health care, from community assistance to dual-use technologies.

In fact, the only comprehensive review of the conversion program to date, conducted by the congressionally-mandated Defense Conversion Commission, was highly critical of the current conversion program, characterizing it as fragmented and disjointed, stating that it failed to address key conversion problems and included many projects that had little or nothing to do with conversion.

According to the General Accounting Office, whom I have tasked to track defense conversion spending, as of last month, not even 25 percent of the \$1.7 billion appropriated for last year's conversion program had been spent; and more than half of what has been spent was for pre-existing technology programs which the Congress recategorized as conversion.

Even funds appropriated for defense conversion in fiscal year 1991 remain unobligated.

Despite this slow rate of spending, and despite dwindling defense budgets, the Armed Services Committee added nearly \$800 million to the administration's already generous \$2.2 billion 1994 defense conversion request.

Ironically, the only real constant in the evolving defense conversion debate involves the practice of taking money from the defense budget and using it to attempt to salve the wounds created by reductions in that same defense budget—it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy as the more defense money we spend on conversion, the greater the turmoil and disruption and therefore, the greater the need for even more conversion spending.

After watching this closely for several years, I have come to the conclusion that the worst possible response to the economic challenges posed by the defense drawdown is to engage in a reallocation of dwindling defense dollars for thinly disguised conversion programs.

Instead, I believe we should carefully manage defense resources in order to retain an efficient and responsive defense industrial sector able to meet future national security needs while incorporating the more efficient management practices of the civilian sector.

While many self-proclaimed conversion experts dismiss the views of the defense industry with disdain, you do not have to scratch very deep to discover profound skepticism among defense industry professionals over the viability, worth and goals of the current conversion approach.

Industry is asking for government assistance, but not in the form of large appropriations for new-age dual-use technologies. Rather, they are asking for a slower, more predictable, and more manageable defense drawdown as a way of minimizing job loss, preserving financial viability and allowing an orderly contraction of the defense production base.

For instance, there is a pressing need for sweeping reform of the defense acquisition process. In addition, other legal changes must be examined in the areas of antitrust, investment tax credits, and harmonization of international standards and export promotion, among others.

Unlike the current conversion program, these kinds of initiatives would not drain dwindling defense dollars

away from military readiness and needed investment in defense capabilities. However, they would keep more defense workers employed and directly address the need to preserve vital defense industrial base capabilities.

This is the kind of readjustment that this Congress should recommend. While we must be sensitive to, and where prudent, provide for the needs of workers, firms, and communities being affected by the severe defense cuts we are implementing, it cannot be done at the expense of the defense sector that is the backbone of America's still second-to-none military forces in a changing and increasingly turbulent world.

The rule makes in order three amendments dealing with the conversion issue.

The first amendment, originally filed under my name, will be offered by my friend and colleague on the Armed Services Committee, Mr. HANSEN. This amendment would fully fund the Office of Economic Adjustment, the DOD agency responsible for providing help to communities impacted by base or plant closures.

In short, the Hansen amendment will make sure that in the effort to help out those communities most severely impacted, we don't steal money from the rest of the 50 plus communities also hurting from base closures. This is a fairly straightforward amendment that deserves the support of the House.

The second amendment, offered by Mr. ANDREWS, prohibits the use of defense conversion money to provide loan guarantees to companies wishing to export defense products. This amendment was offered and defeated in committee by a significant bipartisan majority. I voted against it then and plan to oppose it now, for I believe that we must actively consider ways to assist our defense industry to compete in the international marketplace.

The Andrews amendment continues to have technical problems—it misses the target it intends to hit since there are no conversion moneys being used for export financing. But more importantly, it moves in the wrong direction in terms of adopting government policies to protect jobs and capabilities in one of the most vital sectors of our economy.

Finally, Mr. WALKER will offer an amendment that I strongly support dealing with the Technology Reinvestment Program or TRP. The bill before the House makes a very important change to current law that requires that projects competing for TRP dollars have a direct national security benefit. This statutory requirement makes perfect sense; defense dollars ought to be used for defense purposes and strengthen the defense industrial base.

The Walker amendment would maintain existing law by eliminating provisions in H.R. 2401 that weaken this requirement.

Finally, the Walker amendment eliminates the \$300 million add to the administration's request for the TRP, leaving a more than adequate \$275 million to fund this unproven program for next year.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Hansen and Walker amendments and to oppose the Andrews amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE], a distinguished member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I have long worked to see that defense conversion becomes a reality in this country, and as a freshman on the Committee on Armed Services, I am so excited to be working on real defense conversion.

Mr. Chairman, it is for that reason I rise in support of the Andrews-Kasich amendment to make sure limited conversion dollars are used for real economic conversion, and not to subsidize foreign arms sales. The people of this country want real conversion, and my constituents know the difference between arms sales and conversion.

Mr. Chairman, the United States is already the world's No. 1 arms dealer. We need to develop our manufacturing base. We need to develop our electronics industry. We need to become competitive in environmental technology. But we do not need to sell more arms.

Mr. Chairman, it is because of this that I urge Members to support the Andrews-Kasich amendment to ensure that we do all we can to diversify our industrial base and to make America become truly globally competitive.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, first let me join in the remarks made by the distinguished ranking member of the committee, with which I generally concur. But I especially want to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the chairman of our committee, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, for their support and cooperation in including in the bill the national shipbuilding initiative. Without their leadership and the joint bipartisan efforts of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, on each of which I serve, we would very likely be ruling out any hope of building commercial vessels in U.S. shipyards ever again.

I would also be remiss if I did not thank Chairman LIPINSKI and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] for their persistence and dedication in this effort.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly pleased to see that we have expanded

the Title XI Loan Guarantee Program to vessels built for export. Demand is projected to almost double for this segment of the market by the year 2000. Changes in H.R. 2401 assure us the opportunity to participate in this lucrative market.

The media in recent days reported that the Export-Import Bank gave preliminary approval to \$4.8 billion in loan guarantees to McDonnell Douglas and Boeing for sale of airliners to Saudi Arabia.

□ 1510

The title XI provisions in this bill will now allow the same type of access to world markets that Boeing and McDonnell Douglas have for our shipyards.

Finally, under the Credit Reform Act, the \$200 million authorized in H.R. 2401 will actually result in over \$2 billion in new ship construction. In this period of fiscal restraint, one would be hard pressed to find a more efficient use of Federal funds.

While there is a reasonable concern about elements of the economic conversion provisions in the bill, the Shipbuilding Loan Guarantee program is entirely supportable as it will help guarantee domestic shipbuilding survival as a national security requirement and will reduce the level of unemployment in shipyards as naval shipbuilding programs decline.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Andrews amendment. Let me begin by clarifying an important definition for my colleagues and the defense industry.

If you look in your dictionary, conversion is defined as the act of changing from one form or function to another. Therefore, defense conversion is to change from the defense industry to another industry—such as one defense contractor's idea to transform MX missile systems into nutritional planning for hospital patients, or turning a machine shop at a closing naval shipyard into a manufacturing plant for car engines.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the meaning of conversion as do my constituents as they await the largest civilian job loss of the 1993 military bases slated for closure when Mare Island Naval Shipyard closes, eliminating over 5,500 direct civilian jobs in the next 2½ years.

Let me lay before you and my colleagues another fact. About 60 percent of the world's arms sales to the Third World are by U.S. companies. Clearly, in spite of any competition with government-subsidized European arms manufacturers, United States companies are managing to sell more weapons than the rest of the arms-exporting

nations combined. Furthermore, our Government has a military foreign aid program whose annual average funding of \$3 billion is largely used to finance U.S. foreign arms sales. We do subsidize the export of arms by U.S. weapons manufacturers. The market for foreign weapons sales exists without loan guarantees by the American taxpayer.

I am truly outraged by the audacity of some of my colleagues and defense industry giants who suggest that our scarce defense conversion dollars should be used to promote arms sales overseas. Promotion foreign arms sales is not conversion, pure and simple. Just because you call it conversion doesn't make it so.

Mr. Chairman, my constituents in Vallejo, CA, will certainly experience a disaster over the next 2 years as unemployment climbs to more than 30 percent when Mare Island Naval Shipyard closes. Should they be allowed to apply for disaster relief funds? No. Disaster relief funds are intended for victims of natural disasters and my constituents would not dream, no matter how desperate they become, of taking scarce dollars away from the flood victims in the Midwest or Hurricane Andrew victims in Florida. Surely it is no more appropriate for companies such as McDonnell Douglas and General Dynamics to take conversion funds to promote overseas arms sales.

This is a most egregious offense to the sensibility of Americans. If my constituents understand and respect the intent of the multitudes of Government assistance programs and the conversion funds for which they may apply, surely McDonnell Douglas and General Dynamics can. We must not let these companies continue to insult our intelligence by claiming that changing the recipient of the arms they manufacture represents a form of defense conversion.

I do not know how any of my colleagues can explain to their constituents why funding intended to lessen the impact of our country's downsizing—downsizing made possible by the end of the cold war—is being used to promote arms sales. Perhaps they are thinking that if we sell enough arms overseas, we will not need to downsize our military at all. Perhaps McDonnell Douglas and General Dynamics believe that the world should have more Bosnias and Somalias.

Mr. Chairman, my constituents would disagree, and so do I.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for the Andrews amendment.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking Republican member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the deputy whip and a leader on conversion and technology efforts.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I want to talk briefly about an amendment that I will be offering at the appropriate time later on. That is an amendment to remove \$300 million of spending that was put in by the committee in the TRP effort, an amount of money that is well over what the President requested.

My particular amendment will be aimed at bringing the spending back down to the President's request of \$275 million in this area. The fact is that this particular money that was added in in committee is going to end up, I think, being put into areas where we already are getting indications of some waste, fraud, and abuse.

Under the provisions that are going to be brought forward on this amendment, a large share of the money is going to be transferred to the Commerce Department for inclusion in their extension programs. One of these Commerce Department industrial grant programs is the advanced technology program.

On September 3, the General Accounting Office reported that 16 of the advanced technology program grantees had indirect costs over 100 percent and that 4 had rates over 200 percent going as high as 250 percent.

What does that mean? That means that in these cases in the industrial technology grants they are going for overhead, for administration costs, for facilities, and heaven knows what else. What is not being done is it is not paying for technology.

And if this money is to be aimed at technology, we are not going to get the bang for the buck in the programs to which this money is going to be transferred. So my suggestion is this, we take the \$300 million out of the TRP program and keep it available for some of the other areas for economic conversion such as community assistance and personnel assistance and a number of other places where we can be assured that the money will be better used.

I can assure the House that the \$300 million that is in the program right now that I will seek to remove will be wasted if it is kept there.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. ANDREWS], a member of the committee, who will later offer an amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, at the end of the cold war there was a tremendous amount of excitement and enthusiasm about what that might mean to the planet and to the United States. The Third World nations would be able to use their resources in dealing with the problems that they are facing, economic and famine problems, and the loss of hope and that we at home could start using our industrial base and our workforce now to build those products and services

that we need to build in order to rebuild the economy as opposed to weapons of the cold war.

Since the post-cold-war era is upon us, we have begun to learn some lessons. Secretary Aspin has told us that in the post-cold-war era, one of the greatest challenges that we face as a country is the regional conflicts that exist around the world in regions where there is tension generated from religious, cultural or nationalistic conflicts.

We also know that conventional arms races around this planet are fueling these flames and creating tremendous problems around those regions.

We have also learned that since the end of Desert Storm, Mr. Chairman, the United States has become the largest exporter of arms on the planet. We sell more arms to the Third World than all other nations in this world combined. This is all supported by billions of tax dollars through our military aid programs, research and development dollars, financing and loan guarantees.

We also know, Mr. Chairman, that in Desert Storm, and in Somalia, and Panama, the young Americans that we sent into harm's way found themselves looking down the barrel of American weapons and American weapons technology.

I think, clearly, Mr. Chairman, these facts point to the reality that we have got to stop and look at the direction that we are heading in this country and reassess the policies that are fueling this conventional arms race and sending our young men and women into harm's way facing our own weapons. At the very least, I am proposing today an amendment, along with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], that says that while we look at and debate this issue, let us recognize that the administration's commitment to defense conversion has been met with some proposals that we take a portion of that defense conversion money and use it to finance and support even more foreign arms sales to these countries.

What our amendment does, clearly and very simply, is to say, defense conversion is not foreign arms sales. Specifically and clearly, Mr. Chairman, this amendment before us today, later on this afternoon, will clearly say that financial assistance, underwriting for foreign arms sales is not defense conversion.

We need every penny of that conversion money to go to help businesses and industries and communities and workers to build the things that this economy needs in this country, not to continue to fuel this conventional arms race which is destroying our planet and injuring our young people.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to our own top gun expert, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, we have a strange dichotomy in this country that we laud the men and women that fight our wars. Then we cut below the critical readiness level and, when we fight the next level, men and women die because of it.

Let me give Members the good, the bad, and the ugly of this. California's 52 Members, led by the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD], and progressive industry, are working together in a bipartisan measure to support defense conversion.

The bad of it, under the 1990 defense cut, 30 percent, which equated to \$50 billion, cost California half-a-million jobs. The Clinton tax package cut an additional \$127 billion, which will cost us 2 million jobs.

Defense conversion will not compute to one-thousandth of these job losses.

California took the lion's share of base closure. Two female Members of the other body said, "Don't close our bases in California," that are supporting this also voted to cut defense \$127 billion.

□ 1520

California's 9 percent unemployment, some of the defense cuts that will cost 2 million jobs, Federal mandates, the Clinton tax plan that takes \$40 billion out of banking regulations, that shuts down banks, Federal mandates that support illegal immigration services, are all counterproductive to this measure.

We need to support the items in conversion. However, it will not keep up with the job losses. Amounts such as a bridge system used by stealth technology and composite materials to strengthen our bridges, that is good. New highway systems, that is good, out of conversion, and a lot of others, but it will never keep up with the job losses.

The liberals think this is a good way to say, "Hey, let us cut defense and make it okay with conversion." It is not going to sell, and this dog does not hunt.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I was really pleased to hear the gentleman come out in favor of the bridge project and some of the uses of the composites. I know it is around his district in that area where that leadership is going.

I think the gentleman is absolutely right that it is not going to totally replace, one-for-one, the jobs, but it is important that we advance it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I agree with the gentlewoman.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, would the Chair state how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. REYNOLDS). The gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] has 7 minutes remaining.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAMBURG].

Mr. HAMBURG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the defense conversion portion of this bill.

The end of the cold war is a welcome event, not only for the lack of threat that emanates from overseas, but also because it gives us an opportunity to refocus our energies here in the United States. For decades upon decades, we have spent, and sometimes squandered, trillions and trillions of dollars building a war machine unparalleled in human history.

Now is the time to face our enemies within: A stagnant economy, a declining standard of living, poverty, homelessness, environmental degradation. These are all things that contribute to national insecurity.

The defense conversion portion of this bill addresses many of these problems, by attempting to move our industrial economy from defense-based to civilian-based. It also aims to ensure that communities, like those in my district that will be affected by the closure of Mare Island Naval Shipyard, have adequate resources to rebuild the economic base of their communities. In 3 years Mare Island will lock its gates as a military facility; however, with the proper assistance it will begin a new incarnation. The Federal Government has a responsibility not to simply abandon people who have given their lives to public service.

In this bill, funding for the Office of Economic Adjustment, the front-line agency for initial planning grants that help communities begin the conversion process, is greatly increased. Grants are established for higher education to retrain and educate laid-off workers, so that they may begin to move toward a successful life in the private sector. The National Shipbuilding Initiative aims to revitalize the sagging commercial shipbuilding industry in the United States.

Each of these components is part of a vision for the post-cold war United States. We must move forward from the mentality which has crippled our industrial base, which has kept us from addressing the many pressing national security problems within our borders. The global economy rewards innovation over stagnation and a dynamic economic base, not one that is dominated by the military-industrial complex.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise first of all to commend the gentlewoman from Colorado for her leadership on the issue of

defense conversion. Having been asked by our Republican ranking member to chair the conversion effort in the committee, I had the pleasure of working with her. In fact, we made some significant contributions during the debate in the full committee and in the subcommittee on conversion issues.

For instance, we deleted unnecessary bureaucracies now required by law. We added a stringent reporting requirement on the efficacy of the host of programs funded through defense conversion, and we offered significant reform in the way DOD acquires commercial products. These are items that are a meager beginning, a modest beginning, but are things that the defense community have told us could best help them, better utilize our limited defense dollars.

I want to bring up some cautions now and raise some red flags. What concerns me is that we are using defense conversion as the Santa Clause to give away all the goodies to Members who perhaps are going to lose defense installations. Let me cite some facts and numbers for my colleagues who may be back in their offices right now.

According to both the Office of Technology Assessment and the Congressional Budget Office, in studies we requested in a bipartisan manner earlier this year, if the Clinton defense cuts are implemented over the next 5 years and we cut defense by \$128 billion, we can talk about defense conversion all we want, but here are the hard numbers.

Today there are 5.5 million Americans who work for the Pentagon or who work in defense-related jobs. OTA and CBO estimate that under the current guideline proposals for defense spending, 2.8 million men and women will lose their jobs. So it is nice to hear all these proposals about new technologies, but let us talk about those 2.8 million American men and women who are right now looking to the unemployment line as General Dynamics and Martin Marietta and all the other major defense contractors are in the midst of downsizing, because we are trying in this body and in this administration to cut defense spending so rapidly.

In terms of conversion, I also want to mention a point that was raised by our distinguished Republican ranking member. That is that GAO estimates as recently as a month ago that 25 percent of the funds that were appropriated last year have been obligated, and 75 percent of those dollars are still unobligated. So here we are taking a conversion package that actually increases substantially the amount of money that the President requests. Actually in the TRP program we are going to add, if we follow through on this bill, \$300 million above and beyond what the President has asked for the TRP program, when in fact we have

only spent 25 percent of the money that we appropriated last year.

A third point I want to mention, we have been told that the TRP program is really going to be so successful because we had over 2,000 applications, and some of those applications, by the way, I supported.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman. I reserve the balance of my time, and I will make some additional points after other Members have had a chance to speak.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN], a member of the committee.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Andrews-Kasich amendment to prohibit the use of defense conversion funds to help finance arms sales overseas.

Economic security has been declared an official mission of the Department of Defense. The moral test of our Nation will be in determining how we achieve economic security. In my view, we have to find ways to strengthen our defense conversion programs to ease the transition to a post-cold war economy. We cannot allow our concerns about jobs to become an excuse to export weapons that feed instability across the globe.

President Clinton has proposed a 5 year \$20 billion defense conversion program. The committee authorized over \$3 billion in the fiscal year 1994 DOD authorization act to continue the Defense Conversion, Reinvestment and Transition Assistance Act for industry and technology conversion, personnel transition, and community adjustment. We should put that money toward programs that provide jobs making products that improve the quality of life here, not weapons designed to destroy lives and property.

While defense workers will face tricky adjustments as a result of reduced military budgets, I think aggressive conversion to civilian use of defense capacity will create more jobs than continued arms production. We cannot expect to successfully manage the transition unless we make hard choices now.

A decision on the Andrews-Kasich amendment is one of the easier choices we will be faced with. It does not prevent arms sales abroad—it simply bars the use of defense conversion funds to finance arms sales.

The United States has a moral obligation to curb the proliferation of arms sales to the Third World. Join me in supporting the Andrews-Kasich amendment.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, continuing my discussion of the TRP program, one of the

amendments we are going to debate today is going to be the Walker amendment, which takes the TRP funding back to the original request of this President. I want to repeat this for my colleagues, who perhaps are not aware of this. President Clinton asked for \$275 million of new money for the TRP program.

□ 1530

Our committee added \$300 million above what President Clinton asked for, even though the GAO says we have only committed 25 percent of the money from last year's bill.

I want to make two points here. The first point is that while we are saying we have a ton of applications that have come in, and that could be argued correctly, ARPA has said publicly that their experience in solicitations is that they generally, and I quote, "are not embarrassed to fund roughly 10 to 15 percent of the proposals." So just because we have 2,800 applications does not necessarily mean we are going to fund anywhere near 2,800 proposals, and in fact if you listen to what the ARPA is saying, probably it is going to be more like 10 percent to 15 percent.

I want to make a second point. We are going to be hearing during the discussion about ARPA and the TRP program today that the corporate community in America is jumping at this. I would ask my colleagues to look very closely at the source of the bulk of the applications coming in for the TRP program. Many of these applications are not coming from corporate America, they are coming from academic institutions, they are coming from non-profit institutions that see this as a nice way to expand their bureaucracy, and they are not necessarily going to immediately guarantee any new job creation.

The point I want to make is that when we hear this pie in the sky notion that corporate America is jumping at this program because they see tremendous prospects for new job creation, that is really not totally true. A significant amount of these applications are coming from nonprofits, from academic institutions, some of which I would be supportive of.

But I want to make the point that this is not going to be the cure-all solution that perhaps we think it might be.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding. He is indeed a gentleman.

I just wanted to point out that the reason the funding has not been all spent is because of this TRP competition that the gentleman mentioned. And it will be very shortly spent. But we wanted it to be juried, and we want-

ed it to be looked at, and I am sure that the gentleman would agree with that. So I think that is kind of a phony issue, let us be honest about it.

Mr. WELDON. If I may reclaim my time, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments about corporate America, but I maintain and repeat that ARPA has said that they are not embarrassed that the only fund 10 percent to 15 percent of the proposals that have given solicitation. It does not take a rocket scientist to multiply 10 percent of the amount of money available.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Andrews-Kasich amendment to the defense authorization bill. This worthy amendment, offered by our distinguished colleagues from Maine and Ohio, prohibits the diversion of economic conversion funds to subsidize arms sales abroad.

Mr. Chairman, in the post-cold war era it is absolutely vital that our defense industry be aided in the difficult transition from wartime production to the pursuit of advanced technologies for peaceful purposes. With over 400,000 defense jobs having been eliminated over the past 5 years and America facing the prospect of losing 1 million more defense positions in the near future, the pain, suffering, and anxiety of workers in the defense industry must be stopped.

The picture before us is clear. The only real solution lies in developing new technologies for civilian uses that will create high-paying jobs. It is thus crucial that the defense industry be assisted in the conversion drive to retool for peacetime production.

I find it ludicrous that some would urge we pillage our already meager funds for defense conversion by subsidizing additional arms sales. Even if the proposed level of conversion funding is kept intact, we are nowhere near meeting urgent needs: Barely one-eighth of the worthy conversion proposals submitted to DOD can be funded.

The Andrews-Kasich amendment will stop shortsighted attempts to temporarily bolster the defense industry by raiding conversion funds. Such arms sales financing schemes will only prolong the defense industry's slow death—and ultimately sacrifice the future and rapid development of an important and vitally needed segment of our economy.

Moreover, I have long advocated that the United States should reduce her reliance on arms sales abroad. Last year we sold to the developing nations of the world over \$13.6 billion in weapons of death, well over 57 percent of all arms sales to the developing world. How can we legitimately criticize

other countries for arms transfers—for example, China—when our volume of weapons sales in 1992 was 136 times greater than the People's Republic of China? Certainly, our great Nation, if we are to credibly argue for a safer world, can stand to diminish her role as the planet's leading merchant of death.

I urge our colleagues to support the Andrews-Kasich amendment. It will contribute to a stronger America and a safer world.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself my remaining 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, just in closing out the debate on this issue, I want to go back to the point that Members of both sides feel that there is a need to work with our industrial base to look to find ways that we can use existing technology to create dual commercial jobs, and all of us want to work toward that end. The question is not whether we are for conversion or not, the question is at what rate we are going to spend the money in a tough budget time such as we are having now as the President is proposing to cut defense by \$128 billion. Should we be going above and beyond what this President has requested when the GAO has said we have not even spent the money that is already in the pipeline?

Perhaps no one has worked more for dual-use technology than this gentleman along with a number of my colleagues in this body who have fought for the last 4 years to maintain the Osprey program. I support dual-use technology. I support efforts to work with defense contractors to find ways to streamline the acquisition process. But we have to be careful that we do not go overboard, and that this defense conversion misnomer does not become a Santa Claus so that Members of Congress can look to it to take care of special projects and special industries in their districts where they are losing significant jobs because of our defense cutbacks. That is one major concern.

Another major concern in terms of the amendments is the Andrews amendment. I think it is wrongheaded. It does not properly address the concerns of the ability of our contractors to finance the sales of noncombatant technology, for instance helicopters, for instance the V-22 which the Japanese and the Europeans want to buy, for those items that perhaps our defense companies make that they in fact would like to import.

So I would ask my colleagues to listen intently to the pros and cons in this discussion on the Andrews-Kasich amendment, as it is being called, because I think there are potentially serious flaws with that amendment. And I think we ought to go back and rethink that whole issue.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we will now consider three very important amendments on

the issue of defense economic conversion. Before discussing these amendments and as chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Research and Technology, which has jurisdiction over defense conversion, I want briefly to review the defense conversion title of the fiscal year 1994 DOD authorization bill.

As my colleagues know, the House Armed Services Committee sought to build upon the Defense Conversion, Reinvestment, and Transition Assistance Act of 1992 and President Clinton's announced defense conversion initiative of March 11 of this year.

To this end, we have authorized \$2.735 billion in our committee's bill together with enhanced and new defense economic conversion and reinvestment initiatives. In the technology area, those emphasizing defense conversion and reinvestment are:

TECHNOLOGY REINVESTMENT PROJECT

Allocated \$575 million for continuation of the President's technology reinvestment project [TRP]. This is still not as much as the \$605 million authorized last year. We have authorized this program to require cost sharing from the private sector and require awards be made on competitive basis.

Despite adding \$300 million to the administration's request, this program is still, in my view, underfunded. This year's TRP authorization represents roughly only one-quarter of 1 percent of the entire DOD budget. Still, almost 3,000 proposals from thousands of participants have been received for nearly \$9 billion in Government-shared funding.

This avalanche of interest in the TRP sends an unmistakable signal: Defense conversion is an idea whose time has come. We can no longer neglect our economic security if we are to remain strong militarily. And we cannot remain strong militarily unless we utilize our total national technology base, including DOD's share, as a launching pad for the growth industries of the future in such areas as communications, environmental clean-up, shipbuilding, aerospace, advanced materials, cost-cutting medical technologies, and other areas vital to economic security. This is what the committee's bill seeks to accomplish.

NATIONAL SHIPBUILDING INITIATIVE

In addition to the TRP we have provided \$300 million for a national shipbuilding initiative contained in the bill will hopefully revive an industrial sector to make us competitive in the world again to build commercial ships in U.S. shipyards in an environmentally compliant way; \$200 million is provided in loan guarantees and \$100 million in R&D funding in coordination with the technology reinvestment project.

PERSONNEL RETRAINING INITIATIVES

The committee bill also contains continued authority and new, biparti-

san initiatives to reemploy discharged military personnel and defense workers in the areas of teaching, law enforcement, health care, and environmental cleanup. We urgently need to redeploy the talents of those who won the cold war and Desert Storm to fight and win the global economic battles of today and tomorrow. It is important to understand that these initiatives provide a path to real employment in occupations where there are local shortages.

COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE

The committee bill recognizes the funding shortfall facing the agencies of the Department of Defense working to assist communities bearing the brunt of base closings and defense reductions. Accordingly, we have increased the funding request for the Pentagon's Office of Economic Adjustment by \$40 million to \$69 million and targeted this assistance to those communities especially hard hit by the latest round of base closings and defense spending reductions. Such efforts complements the activities of the Economic Development Administration of U.S. Department of Commerce in providing economic adjustment planning and implementation assistance.

DEFENSE CONVERSION AMENDMENTS

Very shortly, we will have the opportunity to reaffirm the committee's position on providing appropriate levels of defense conversion assistance to provide stimulus and hope to those sectors and workers of our Nation impacted by defense cuts. Unfortunately, two of the amendments before us would have the effect of undercutting a promising defense conversion program when it is most desperately needed.

OPPOSE THE WALKER AMENDMENT

One amendment in this area proposed by Mr. WALKER of Pennsylvania would reduce funding for the technology reinvestment project by \$300 million. Adoption of this amendment will impede our efforts to fund the quality TRP proposals. It will also scale back our ability to facilitate defense conversion efforts by limiting support for defense conversion to only those objectives which enhance only the military. This misapprehends the connection between economic and military security. In short, it is a killer amendment which should be resoundingly defeated.

But the Walker amendment would do more than simply stymie defense conversion efforts. Reducing funds for the TRP will only invite foreign companies to commercialize the quality developmental projects being received by the TRP. In so doing, we will return to the treadmill we have been on where our foreign competitors commercialize U.S. technology and sell it back to us at the cost of lost jobs and lower wages. We must not allow this to happen. Vote down the Walker amendment.

OPPOSE THE SPENCE AMENDMENT

A second amendment will be offered to reduce funding for TRP projects by

\$40 million. This amendment proposed by Mr. SPENCE of South Carolina would also increase funding for the Pentagon's Office of Economic Adjustment by \$40 million. As I have pointed out, the committee bill already increases OEA funding by \$40 million.

While the Spence amendment is well-intentioned, I must respectfully suggest it has the adverse, unintended consequences of reducing support for defense conversion programs specifically provided for small- and medium-sized businesses. This is because the manner in which the committee has funded the defense dual-use assistance extension programs. We have proposed that not less than 30 percent of the \$50 million provided for this program be provided to facilitate computer resource assistance to small businesses for networking to find alternative markets, partners. This program which has been pioneered by the State of Minnesota with the support of the House Small Business Committee with very impressive results.

A second adverse consequence of the Spence amendment would be its reduction of our ability to provide loan guarantees to small- and medium-sized businesses wanting to capitalize non-defense markets. Again, we provided 30 percent of the \$50 million in support of the loan guarantee defense diversification program sponsored by our colleague Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER from New York.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Spence amendment since it would reduce our ability to support proven programs to help small and medium businesses cope with reduction in defense spending.

SUPPORT THE ANDREWS/KASICH AMENDMENT

A third amendment being made in order is the amendment proposed by Mr. ANDREWS of Maine and Mr. KASICH of Ohio to prohibit the use of defense conversion funds from financing arms sales abroad. Clearly, arms sales are not defense conversion. Importantly, this amendment is consistent with administration policy which is to rule out the financing of such sales from the \$20 billion multiyear defense conversion budget. Importantly, this amendment has been modified to restrict this prohibition to financing arms exports and permits a waiver in the case of an item developed with defense funding being used for civilian end-use. An example here could be the V-22 tilt-rotor aircraft for short-haul civilian aviation use.

At the same time, it may be important to examine the suitability of efficacy of Government-backed loan guarantees for defense exports as one of the several tools to help defense contractors remain viable as U.S. military needs decline. The Andrews-Kasich amendment allows such an examination to occur without diverting defense conversion funding to unrelated pur-

poses. And such an examination will have to include whether such mechanisms unwittingly make U.S. defense firms dangerously dependent on foreign weapons sales; contribute to regional instability and conflict; reduce U.S. employment because of so-called offset agreements which require transfer of jobs as a condition of the sale; or impede our larger international trade strategy of which defense trade should be only one aspect in the post-cold war era. I urge my colleagues to support the Andrews-Kasich amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity to enhance our defense conversion program by taking the appropriate action on the amendments before us. I hope my colleagues will follow the recommendations of our committee and vote accordingly.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that a proposal could also put up in-kind services?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Of course it could put up in-kind services, but a very high percentage of them have put up cash, cash, which is more than the amount that we have got funded even with our \$300 million add-on. The tragedy is that we cannot do it even faster.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. REYNOLDS). All time for general debate on this issue has expired.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 in part 4 of House Report 103-223.

AMENDMENT, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. HANSEN

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], I offer an amendment, as modified.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment, as modified.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Amendment, as modified, offered by Mr. HANSEN:

After section 1303 of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1304. ALTERATIONS IN FUNDING FOR DEFENSE CONVERSION, REINVESTMENT, AND TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) COMMUNITY ADJUSTMENT AND DIVERSIFICATION.—The amount provided in section 1321(a) (relating to community adjustment and diversification assistance) is hereby increased by \$40,000,000.

(b) OFF-SETTING REDUCTIONS.—The amount specified in the matter preceding the paragraphs in section 1311 for activities of the Department of Defense under chapter 148 of title, 10, United States Code, and section 2197 of such title is hereby reduced by \$40,000,000, of which—

(1) 50 percent of such reduction is hereby achieved by reducing the funding for the manufacturing extension program, as provided in paragraph (5) of section 1311, by \$20,000,000; and

(2) 50 percent of such reduction is hereby achieved by reducing the funding for the defense dual-use extension program, as provided in paragraph (6) of such section, by \$20,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have a little problem regarding the chairman's mark. As we all know, base closures are adversely impacting many communities across the Nation. People are losing their jobs, people are having different kinds of problems.

But I want to talk about the chairman's mark where there is apparent inconsistency, and I hope we all think this through. In the chairman's mark we are going to take \$69 million, and we are going to distribute it to 64 communities.

On July 2 of 1993 the President of the United States, Mr. Clinton, said a minimum to go to each community would be \$1 million. Also in the chairman's mark it picks up on eight of these communities that would receive a designation of catastrophic.

□ 1540

These catastrophic folks are even going to get \$6 million right off the top. Let us do some simple math: \$48 million is taken care of, of the \$69 million. Now you have 56 other communities. How can they possibly get the \$1 million that President Clinton said they should get? There is no way in the world that they can. Of those eight communities—San Diego, Sacramento, San Francisco, Oakland, Charleston, Dallas-Fort Worth, upstate New York, and Philadelphia—there is absolutely no question that they are meritorious and they deserve the money; nobody would argue with that. These communities should have the money. But how do we ever figure out this basic math?

All this amendment does is it adds \$40 million out of this ARPA money that we have been talking about, puts it back in so that these communities can receive the money given to them. Now, that is simply, Mr. Chairman—what this amounts to, fairness, equity, that we should come up to to take care of that. No one is arguing about the eight communities.

There is no way that this thing is structured now, the chairman's mark, that we can take care of the obligation we gave these people.

Now, you can say what is this? This is strictly a matter of prioritizing, that those little communities wherever they may be, in Tooele, Utah, or Colorado or Wyoming, that they can at least get

that million dollars so that the office of economic group can take care of them and somewhat alleviate the pain that we are talking about in this particular problem of base closing. It is just a matter of fairness. I do not see why there should be any question on it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER], a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

Let me speak to my colleagues and to the Nation as an engineer, and as someone who comes from the defense community, who worked for over 20 years on some very important technology that has in fact helped us to be the No. 1 Nation on this Earth militarily, and certainly I was pleased to spend my time doing that.

Let me share my remarks as an engineer: Certainly we won the cold war, and we should rejoice in that. The probability of a nuclear war today is zero. But clearly we need to maintain strong conventional capability to meet the challenges that do and will continue to exist around the world.

Since 1985, defense spending has been coming down and will continue to decline into the future. Clearly, we must do our best to help those people, the people from the aerospace community, who have in fact won the cold war. We should not throw them out. We should maintain them, and we should help them and support them in transitioning into commercial products and certainly do our best to maintain an industrial base so that in the future, as we need weapons systems, these people are available.

How do we do that? The conversion, dual-use program is the way to go. It creates jobs.

If, for example, we needed a widget for the Air Force and we took \$10 million and invested it in some company, they would put 100 people to work and in a year they would produce whatever that widget was, and that is fine. What we are talking about here is a conversion program, using the TRP and using the ARPA, we would still take those 100 people, put them to work spending \$10 million developing a widget, but the idea is to have a dual use for that widget so that once it is developed, the Air Force is happy but we create hundreds of additional jobs because we now also have a commercial product that we can sell around the world to make us more competitive.

That is what this program is all about.

Certainly, the President in fiscal year 1993, which ends at the end of this month, took \$471 million of last year's conversion money and dedicated it to the dual-use program. In this budget

that we are working on right now the President asked for \$275 million. What we are doing this year with this budget is adding \$300 million to that and hopefully more because we do have over \$8.4 billion of proposals to produce commercial products to make us more competitive in the world marketplace. And we need to support as many of these programs as possible. So we must oppose any amendment today that would reduce the conversion money.

As it is, with 1993 money and 1994 money, if we do not change it, we are only going to have a little over \$1 billion to spend. We had 8.4 billion dollars' worth of proposals. We must support as many of those proposals as is possible because we need dual use. It is the best way to create private sector jobs in this country. It is the best way to put our people to work and the best way to thank our aerospace community for the wonderful job they did winning the cold war and to put them to work building the next generation of commercial products that will make us competitive. And the good part of it is that it also maintains our industrial base should we need them to return to producing needed weapons.

This is a program that makes sense. We ought to put much more money into it, and clearly we must oppose all amendments that would reduce this very important funding so necessary to our future and the future of our military and commercial industrial base.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, [Mr. CALVERT].

Mr. CALVERT. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Utah for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hansen amendment.

It is no secret that my State of California is going through some difficult economic times. We have been hit harder than any other State by a combination of base closures and defense and aerospace industry cutbacks.

Obviously, we cannot expect the Federal Government to solve all of our economic difficulties. It will take time for the private sector to adjust and bounce back. But, the Federal Government can—and should—help ease the pain of transition caused by the closing and realigning of military facilities.

The President has promised that every community adversely affected by the closing or realignment of a military base will be eligible to receive \$1 million in Federal funds to help convert the bases to civilian uses.

This is not a lot of money, but it is important to communities such as mine in southern California which already has 13 percent unemployment and must cope with the realignment of March AFB.

Because the President has also proposed to provide a minimum of \$6 million in assistance grants to heavily im-

acted areas, the \$1 million for districts such as mine may not be available as promised. By shifting funds from a program which is already adequately funded to the office of economic adjustment, the Hansen amendment will allow my district and others to receive the full funding that the President has promised without adding new burdens on the Nation's taxpayers or increasing the Federal budget deficit.

If we do not pass this amendment, the President will have to find a new source of funding for the OEA or add to the budget deficit. This amendment will allow the President to keep his commitments without adding to our deficit.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I want to use this time to answer the substantive questions that have come up.

First of all, when this bill came over, there were \$29 million put in for OEA and the committee plussed it up to \$40 million already. We already more than doubled the administration's request.

So that is point No. 1.

Point No. 2: The President has not asked for more money. He is perfectly aware, and I think everyone is aware, that his statement about impacted communities meant that he would be asking for the money over a period of time, phasing it in as they could best use it rather than lump summing it all right now.

The other reason that I think the President feels so strongly about leaving this \$40 million in the TRP Program is for those impacted communities, especially California. That is where a very high percentage of the TRP requests are coming from.

So if you are going to take money out of that account and put it in the OEA account, you are really robbing Peter to pay Paul and, not only that, you are shortchanging the average person in those communities a whole lot more because every dollar that remains in the TRP account must be matched in kind or with hard cash by the person who gets the grant.

□ 1550

Now, the big hope for communities is real jobs, real jobs. I am a little surprised, because on that side of the aisle, we on this side of the aisle usually get attacked for things like the Office of Economic Adjustment saying, "Oh, that is warm fuzzies. You are giving them \$1 million, but you are not giving them real jobs," and so forth.

Here is a chance to do real jobs. You have people saying, "We will put up half the money and develop it into the civilian economy and apply this technology."

The gentleman from San Diego, who was speaking earlier, was mentioning all the new ideas coming out of that

area, new ideas on composites, new ideas on how to rebuild the infrastructure to make them earthquake proof, to do all these good things.

So I hope everybody turns this amendment down. It is precisely what the President wants. It is a way to keep both things on line.

Yes, you have to have some money going into those economies, but let me tell you, anyone who thinks getting \$1 million for each of those economies is going to solve their problem is wrong. It has got to also have a rebuilding of our manufacturing base in the civilian sector. We all know how hard it is to get cash right now. That is why this program has been so oversubscribed; but the good news is those parts of the country are not brain dead. They have come up with a tremendous amount of ideas, and I think this would be a very shortsighted amendment to pass.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me reiterate, if I may with respect to the chairman's remark, it is quite ambiguous what the President really wanted out of this. We have asked, and I am sure the other side has asked, but the question is, do the people need the million dollars now?

I do not understand how we are ever going to take care of these people who are losing jobs, who do not have the community economic base that they have had all these years, how we can expect them to say, "Well, we're going to push this off for maybe 4 or 5 years." That is not the way I think this has been interpreted.

As you look at this, and you have \$60 million, and I appreciate the gentlewoman from Colorado flushing it up to what it is, but at the same time they should have been able to fund it.

It is nice to say we are going to give \$69 million and not give it.

So everyone should realize we have nothing at all that we are upset about of these catastrophic designees. These catastrophic designees are each going to get \$6 million, no question. We agree with the gentlewoman. They do need the money. They do have to have the opportunity to be taken care of.

But does that mean we just reject everybody else in America?

There are 56 other committees being totally rejected because of this. What about them?

Well, they are just little guys. Let us not worry about them. They will work it out. They will all go broke. They will stand in bread lines. No, let us not buy that.

This would merely take this flush account that was \$275 million, flushed up to \$300 million, now \$575 million, and merely say we are going to take \$40 million is all out of that \$575 million, which the gentleman from Pennsylvania aptly pointed out has not even used their 1993 money, and help some of these folks out.

What is wrong with that? This is an innocuous type of thing. It is merely a reaccounting. We are just reauthorizing the money. We are not taking money away. This is what the money was intended for, anyway.

So I just say to my friends from these eight big communities that automatically are going to get our \$6 million, there is no way on earth we can meet the commitment that the President made to give every community a million dollars, unless we follow this amendment.

We are not trying to hurt anyone. We are just trying to take care of those little small communities which America has a way of overlooking in favor of these fat cats, and I say that very respectfully, I mean those who get the money. Let us take care of some of these other people.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Let me try to answer some of the things that have come up. There may have been some ambiguity at the beginning of the year when the administration first took over and did not understand the seriousness of all this, but they are very clear now on what their proposals are.

Now, for anyone who wants to call this account of \$575 million a fat cat account, let me tell you, there are \$9 billion worth of proposals lined up to claim this half a billion dollars that we have in this account, which means we only have one-eighteenth of the money we would need if we tried to fund them all.

I feel a little silly talking to the other side of the aisle about leveraging, but let me tell you, for every one Federal dollar you can spend where you get a dollar put up by the private sector on the other side, that is terrific, so every one of these \$575 million must have a dollar committed on the other side, or they do not get it. That is the kind of leveraging that is very real.

When you look at these proposals, you also find they were not the fat cats. The big mega corporations did not want to pay. These were the people who made America great. These are the entrepreneurs, the small businessmen, interesting new partnerships, interesting new joint ventures. It is a very creative group.

And yes, some of them said they would put in kind, but we have had so many put in hard cash, that is probably going to be the first easy cut. They got way more than enough hard cash proposals that they do not even have enough money to fund those.

Now, for each of these communities, and I am sure the gentleman from Utah that I am very concerned about them, because I happen to have one, we have a base closure in my district.

Yes, I want the million dollars. I want job training, I want all of that. But training for what? If we do not

start creating new jobs in this society, we have not got anything to train them for.

I have gone to many of these job fairs at bases that are closing, and they are pathetic. People are not allowed to come unless they have real jobs. That should be the ground rule. But when you look at the real jobs they are coming with, it is, "Do you want to work as a burger flipper?" in many instances, and that is very degrading. People want us to rebuild this manufacturing infrastructure. That is why we are trying to do everything we can to try to get our shipbuilding back, our manufacturing back, get all of it back that we possibly can from our investment that we have made in this technology and trying to apply it to the civilian sector.

I tell you, if we do not do it, our allies will do it. They have been doing to us over and over again.

I will bet you that 90 percent of the things in your home and 90 percent of the things in my home started with federally funded military research that someone offshore bought and turned into a job.

So what we are trying to say in these very limited dollars is the best way to spend this money is this matching, creating real jobs, building the infrastructure. It is the vision thing.

I really hope you can join us on it.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding this time to me.

I think we hear so much overstating in terms of what the TRP will do, how magnificent this response has been. Let us cite the facts.

Of the \$8 billion of requests, the proposals that are in, \$5 billion is in kind, \$5 billion.

Now, we heard that for every dollar, there was a dollar of private money. Then we hear, well, there was some local in kind match. It is \$5 billion to \$8 billion. Let us get that straight.

The second point is, once again what ARPA said is that 10 to 15 percent funding is a good number. Let us keep those figures in mind, because they are facts.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to disagree with the gentlewoman from Colorado. I have great admiration for what she has done on defense conversion. I voted with her a number of times today on those issues; but as a Californian and as one who has much to gain from a full budget for the technology reinvestment project [TRP] and many proposals for my particular area that are

Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Romero-Barcelo
(PR)
Rose
Roth
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Santorum
Sargallus
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shepherd
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Studds
Swett
Swift

Synar	Towns	Watt
Tanner	Trafcant	Waxman
Tauzin	Tucker	Wheat
Taylor (MS)	Underwood (GU)	Whitten
Taylor (NC)	Unsoeld	Williams
Tejeda	Valentine	Wilson
Thompson	Velazquez	Wise
Thornton	Vento	Woolsey
Thurman	Volkmer	Wyden
Torres	Washington	Wynn
Torricelli	Waters	

NOT VOTING—16

Ackerman	Kopetski	Thomas (CA)
Conyers	Lehman	Vucanovich
Farr	McDermott	Yates
Gutierrez	McNulty	Young (AK)
Hoke	Neal (NC)	
Hyde	Stokes	

□ 1623

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Thomas of California for, with Mr. Stokes against.

Mrs. Vucanovich for, with Mr. Ackerman against.

Mrs. MEEK, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. HALL of Texas changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GOODLING, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during the roll-call vote on number 421. Had I been present, I would have voted "no." My absence did not affect the outcome of the vote.

I ask that this explanation appear immediately after the rollcall vote during the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part 4 of House Report 103-223.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS OF MAINE

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of Maine: At the end of title XIII (page 447, after line 6), insert the following section:

SEC. 1360. RESTRICTION ON USE OF DEFENSE CONVERSION FUNDS FOR THE SALE OR TRANSFER OF DEFENSE ARTICLES OR DEFENSE SERVICES.

(a) RESTRICTION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in this Act and made available for defense conversion programs may be used to finance (whether directly or through the use of loan guarantees) the sale or transfer to foreign countries or foreign entities of any defense article or defense service, including defense articles and defense services subject to section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778).

(b) CIVILIAN END-USE.—The Secretary of Defense may grant exemptions from the restriction of subsection (a) with respect to sales or transfers of defense articles or defense services for civilian end-use.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term "defense article" has the meaning given that term in paragraph (3) of section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794).

(2) The term "defense service" has the meaning given that term in paragraph (4) of such section.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ANDREWS] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment before us today asks us to address the following question: Should defense conversion include the financing of foreign arms sales?

The basic question that this amendment addresses and asks us to address this afternoon is, should defense conversion include the financing of foreign arms sales?

Because of the tremendous confusion about what this amendment is and what it is not, I just want to clarify what it is and what it is not.

This amendment recognizes that the tremendous challenge that we are facing across this country in converting our industrial base, our work force, and our communities that gave so much during the cold war, that helped us to win the cold war, that we need to provide them all the tools that we can to convert into those industries and those resources that we need to win the economic competition of the post-cold war era.

When the proposal from the President became clear that he supported defense conversion, Mr. Chairman, there were elements who said, look, let us take a piece of this conversion money and use it to finance arms sales.

Mr. Chairman, we have limited dollars in the defense conversion area. Regardless of what Members think of the wisdom of the current policies regarding foreign arms sales, this amendment simply says, let us agree that foreign arms sales does not equal conversion. And conversion funds, Mr. Chairman, should be limited and directed to those activities which will help those industries, help those communities and help those workers retool so that they can build high-speed rail, so that they can build advanced telecommunications, so that they can build alternative sources of energy, in short, everything we need

to compete in this next decade and century.

Nothing in this amendment, Mr. Chairman, affects sales or directs commercial sales that are approved and supported by our Government to foreign nations.

Since bringing this idea up to the full committee in July, we had a number of concerns addressed and questions addressed to us. So we made modifications. We changed the amendment, and we have an amendment that, in fact, does exactly what it says.

I urge my fellow Members to support my amendment.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished freshman member of our committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER], who has done a fantastic job on this issue.

□ 1630

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Andrews amendment. This amendment is unnecessary. It has broader negative implications for defense conversions than the associated rhetoric that we are about to hear. The rhetoric associated with the amendment is not in fact what this amendment is about.

The sponsors are claiming it is about stopping the use of defense conversion funds for arms sales. In reality the amendment is simply being used as a vehicle to propound against arms sales, when in fact there is nothing in the administration's request for arms sales; arms sales are not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUYER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I would ask if the gentleman understands that should this amendment pass, there will be an extensive number of people who would be out of work and unemployed. Does the gentleman understand that? Does the gentleman agree with me on that?

Mr. BUYER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do. I do not support this amendment.

Mr. SKELTON. If the gentleman would continue to yield, I do not, either, but I think the author and those of us who are discussing this should understand that this is an unemployment amendment.

Mr. BUYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Armed Services opposed an earlier version of this amendment by a vote of 15 for and 39 against. The amendment is not supported by the Clinton administration's Defense Department.

The amendment is contrary to the export policies of the Clinton administration's Department of Commerce.

The amendment is contrary to economic growth and the maintenance of

this Nation's industrial and technology base.

We should not be taking the time of the House to debate an amendment that was defeated on a 2-to-1 bipartisan basis in our committee markup.

The amendment is a badly crafted amendment. While the sponsors say that their objective is to prohibit the use of defense conversion funds to finance arms sales abroad, the amendment is about much more than prohibiting arms and weapons sales. Because the amendment does not match the sponsors' rhetoric and gets into the legalistic arcania of the Arms Export Control Act, it actually inhibits the very process of defense conversion that the sponsors say they support.

As I have mentioned, our members were against this amendment by a 2 to 1 margin because of concerns over potential unintended consequences of the amendment. The concerns over unintended consequences obtain in the current version of the amendment.

You all have heard of the phrase, "the devil is in the details." This is an example of the devil being in the definitions.

The sponsors of the amendment say that they are opposed to the use of funds authorized for defense conversion purposes being used to finance weapons and arms sales to foreign countries. The problem is that instead of saying what they mean in the amendment, the sponsors use the all-inclusive term "defense articles" which, under the reference they cite in the amendment, includes many of the items authorized under defense conversion. In other words, the sponsors' amendment could in effect prohibit the very defense conversion process that they otherwise support.

Under the reference cited in the amendment for defense articles there is a lengthy list of items that are not arms and are not weapons. The list includes many potential defense conversion items that are defined as defense articles. A few examples of defense articles that are funded by defense conversion and could be affected by the amendment include: advanced composites, engines, patrol vessels, auxiliary vessels, and service craft, navigation systems, power supplies, training equipment, electronic equipment, ground radar, radios and identification equipment, computers, night vision devices, cameras, energy conversion devices.

The items are all in the category of dual use. Under the amendment their sale could be prohibited to a foreign buyer.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUYER. I yield to the gentleman from California for 15 seconds.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is misreading the Arms Export Control Act. The Arms Export

Control Act covers the jurisdiction of the munitions list items. The defense articles are Government sales. We do not have any reason to be providing loan guarantees for Government sales. The gentleman is making an argument that is not related to the actual text of this amendment.

Mr. BUYER. Reclaiming my time—

Mr. BERMAN. The Secretary can waive any of this for civilian purposes.

Mr. BUYER. Reclaiming my time, this is directly related because with defense conversion, we are talking about dual use technologies—

Mr. BERMAN. Dual use technologies are—

Mr. BUYER. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. (Mr. DURBIN). The gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] will desist. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] is recognized and may continue.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, the items that I listed were all in the category of dual use. Under the amendment their sale could be prohibited to a foreign buyer.

The sponsors claim that the waiver provision of the amendment would allow the Secretary of Defense to waive the prohibition for foreign sale for items intended for civilian end use. Does it make sense at a time when the President wants to cut 250,000 Federal jobs, to create yet another Federal bureaucracy to argue the end use potential for an endless list of defense conversion items? This waiver would create yet another hoop for our businesses to jump through in order to compete legitimately in international commerce—a hoop that their competitors in other countries do not have to jump through. And a hoop that is very long—more like a tunnel—that can take months for an approval for a given export license to come out the other end. I don't think our Members think that makes sense.

The sponsors make no distinction as to what countries the prohibition on financing should apply. If Members seek to limit arms sales they need to focus on likely recipients and should not support a blanket prohibition. We should not be making blanket prohibitions on the sale of defense conversion items that apply equally, for example, to Canada as they would apply to a country like Iraq.

The Defense authorization bill has nothing to do with foreign arms sales. Defense conversion has nothing to do with arms sales.

Those Members opposing arms sales have had an opportunity to join with our colleague from California [Mr. BERMAN] in writing to the President on July 30 of this year requesting a reevaluation of U.S. arms transfer policy. Give the President a chance to respond.

This amendment was opposed by a 2 to 1 majority of the committee. It is

not supported by the Clinton administration. It is contrary to the proexport policy of the Commerce Department. It is antigrowth. And it is antibusiness.

This amendment is for a different time and place and does not belong in our debate today. Defeat this amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], my distinguished Republican colleague on the committee.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, maybe we are fighting a losing battle, because every time I come to the floor on this issue we seem to lose, and maybe one time we will have some real change and we can win. This is a real tragedy.

Between 1989 and 1992 the United States was involved in selling 56 percent of the arms transfers around the world, 56 percent, with the current mechanism that we have in place. Now we want to add another mechanism to have even more arms sales? Come on, folks. Talk about the devil in the details, the devil is in the details of the opposition to this program.

This program says, "If you have a legitimate commercial item and you want to sell it, you get an exemption to sell it." Rather than to have to fight to restrain the growth in the sale of arms around the world, this is designed to say, "Folks, let us slow it all down."

Fifty-six percent of the market share of weapons around the world I think is high enough. I do not think we need another mechanism to drive it up beyond 56 percent of the weapons that are sold around the world. Let me show the Members what has happened over the last 7 years.

We might see here that the Soviet Union in 1968 was really leading us, the Soviets in red and the United States in blue. However, in 1990, 1991, and 1992 America has become the super champion, dwarfing everybody else in the world when it comes to the issue of arms sales.

Mr. Chairman, we went to Iraq and we faced our own weapons. There is going to be an en bloc amendment that creates a commission that I worked on with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] to put some rational thinking into this whole issue. If we do not sell, someone else will sell. We have to deal with that.

Under the current mechanism that we have, what we do not need to do is exacerbate the problem. We do not need to capture more than 56 percent of market share.

□ 1640

I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, let us just send this thing into the conference committee. The Senate already has a provision to provide for more exports of weapons. Let us get in the conference committee, and let us work out a reasonable provision that puts some rational thinking

in the sales of arms. Let us not add another structure. Let us do this in a rational manner, give us a chance to go to conference committee.

This amendment is not perfect, but it puts us in the conference committee with a mechanism to try to bring some rationality into this whole issue of selling arms around the world that ultimately endangers the United States of America. Vote for the Andrews amendment.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO], chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness.

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It was defeated overwhelming in the Armed Services Committee. I know the gentleman from Maine is well intentioned, and I agree that we should stop the proliferation of arms around the world and selling weapons systems to every country. But we cannot do it here and disadvantage our people. If we can apply this to every other country, fine.

But what we have to do is have the State Department and the U.S. policy and get these countries together and have an agreement that we will stop these arms sales and buildup of weapons systems around the world. But we do not want to take jobs away from our people, and that is what this would do.

If we do not sell these particular arms, well then somebody else is going to do it. But we should get an agreement so that all of it would be stopped, and not just the United States of America.

So I urge Members to keep American jobs and vote against this amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], a Member who is as concerned about jobs in this country as is any Member in this Chamber.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, U.S. arms sales, as these charts have just indicated, to Third World countries are now greater than any other nation or all other nations combined.

We talk about new threats from abroad. Yet our weapons come back to haunt us. Whether it is in Somalia, or Panama, or the Persian Gulf, American men and women have found themselves looking down the barrel of United States-made weapons.

Now there are those who would take conversion funds which have been set aside to help American workers to finance foreign arms sales. Foreign arms sales are not defense conversion. We need those funds right here at home. We need to expand exports, not arms sales.

The knowledge and experience of the defense industry can be used to make our Nation competitive again, and this amendment, the Andrews-Kasich amendment, is a sensible, reasonable,

modest amendment. Foreign arms sales would simply be excluded from the definition of defense conversion.

So I ask my colleagues not to rob American workers to finance foreign arms sales. Vote for this amendment.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to our very distinguished freshman Member, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT] who has done an excellent job on the committee.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time and for his kind compliment.

Mr. Chairman, the sponsor of this amendment says he is offering it because he wants defense conversion money to be used for defense conversion. That is why I am opposing it. I want defense conversion money to be used for defense conversion.

Here is what the amendment says, and if it passes this is what the law will be:

None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in this act and made available for defense conversion programs may be used to finance the sale or transfer to foreign countries or foreign entities of any defense article.

Defense article, Mr. Chairman, as defined under the statute includes a whole lot more than just defense systems of weapons. It includes composites, it includes electronics, it includes ships, it includes everything that we want these people to produce in defense conversion. So what we are going to be saying to them if we pass this amendment is here is some money and go out and fund these consortiums, produce articles like components for defense conversion, but you cannot export them. We do not want you to send them abroad.

A group of people in my district formed a consortium where they wanted to make a composite that would be used to make bridges stronger and earthquake proof. What we have said is go ahead and build it, but you cannot export it. Maybe there are billions of dollars worth of business to do in Canada with this, but you cannot do it. We do not want you to export to Canada.

Mr. Chairman, there is a time and place for a legitimate and strong debate about arms sales. Many Members of the House feel strongly about it, as I do. I think there has been a lot of loose rhetoric. I think it is important to distinguish between sales to Third World countries and sales to our friends which enhance American security and protect American lives and save thousands of American jobs. I would like the opportunity to have that debate on a bill coming out of the Foreign Affairs Committee. This is not the time or the place. With the complicated procedures already in place, it is going to cost thousands and thousands of U.S. jobs, so if you want to put people out of work, vote for the amendment. The gentleman said vote to have

it in conference, and I am glad that my friend from Ohio said that because if it gets to conference we ought to conference it out, because we had sure better change it or we are going to put an awful lot of people out of work.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON], cochair of our conversion task force and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Economic Policy, Trade and Environment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I just say to my friends that there is no debate here. The facts of the matter are that some of our colleagues who oppose this amendment are just factually wrong.

We are not attacking the fundamental method for financing arms sales. What we are saying is these new dollars ought to be used for the future to do a little long-term planning. We still have lots of money and lots of methods for aiding arms sales. We are doing too much of that. But that is really a different issue.

What we have here is after years of effort a handful of dollars to plan for the future. The choice is a simple one. Do we make some effort to make sure that our defense workers have an opportunity to enter into new products and to make sure they have jobs in the future, or do we take these few scarce resources, spend them fast now, and then not have access in the future markets in defense conversion. Technology that began in defense that has commercial application is not barred from use by the language in this amendment. This amendment, to the contrary, makes sure that the few resources that we have are used to establish new products and new fields with new customers.

Support the amendment. It is a good amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, all this amendment does is prohibit the financing of arms sales or transfers with conversion funds. That is all it does. It does not affect ongoing military sales programs. It simply says use defense conversion money for defense conversion.

Are we so dull witted in this country that the only way we can think of to convert defense production into something else is to increase arms exports around the world? Are we not imaginative enough to figure out other ways to do it? We did it at the end of World War II. We did it at the end of the Korean war. Do we not have the capacity to do it again?

We have told the Russians, who are experiencing an economic catastrophe, we have told the Czechs, who are experiencing economic collapse, that they must cut back on their arms sales. Meanwhile we are shoving ahead, becoming the arms merchant of the world.

America is better than that. Support this amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY], a member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ANDREWS]. First of all, using conversion funds to create a loan guarantee program for foreign arms sales defeats the purpose of conversion. I believe Government funds are better used for conversion programs that diversify the defense industry, not maintain the status quo. Also, the U.S. Government should not be accepting credit risks that private banks are unwilling to undertake.

Second, the loan guarantees are not needed, and amount to reverse burden-sharing. Why should the U.S. taxpayers subsidize rich foreign governments in a program of reverse burden-sharing, when the economies of some of the countries covered by the proposal are growing at almost three times the rate of ours.

Additionally, the U.S. share of world arms sales increased in recent years, while the European share decreased. In 1991—the most recent figures available—the United States sold almost 60 percent of the worldwide arms market. Indeed, insofar as sales to the countries covered under the loan guarantee proposal are concerned, the United States already has a virtual monopoly on the market: we sold 87 percent of arms to those countries, and the Europeans sold only 13 percent.

Finally, the proposal runs contrary to what our policy should be. Using conversion funds for subsidized arms sales would seriously undercut United States appeals to Russia, Ukraine, and former East bloc countries like the Republics of Czech and Slovakia to resist the temptation of selling arms to gain hard currency. Instead of exporting death, we should be setting an example and creating jobs here at home.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Andrews-Kasich DOD amendment. Neither our foreign policy goals nor our domestic economic goals are served when precious defense conversion money is used to fi-

nance weapons abroad. Financing weapons sales abroad is supposed to be the result of a careful and deliberate foreign policy process. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee I take this policy process very seriously. As you know, tremendous time and energy has been invested in passing a foreign aid bill this year. And, about one-quarter of all foreign aid this fiscal year goes to supplying weapons or military training, the lowest percentage in many years. Ninety-five percent of it is in the form of grants to foreign governments generally restricted to purchases of U.S. built weapons. Most of the rest subsidizes \$855 million in low-interest loans to buy U.S. arms on easy credit.

Assisting and encouraging weapons sales is tricky business. In the past, both our lives and our economic interest have been threatened by weapons and weapons technology that was either exported or financed via the American tax dollar. In the last three places the United States Armed Forces went into action—Panama, Iraq, and Somalia—they faced weapons or weapons technology either exported or financed by our own Government. And, many future U.S. markets have been devastated by conflicts fought with U.S. weapons and weapon technology. To finance further arms exports by robbing defense conversion accounts would add insult to injury.

Financing weapons abroad is not legitimate when it is done by robbing defense conversion money. Defense conversion money is supposed to be used to help industries and workers retool for a peacetime economy. While spending resources on the promotion of arms exports may postpone temporarily the pain of downsizing, it does nothing to treat the systemic problem. Defense conversion, on the other hand both eases the pain and treats the core problem. Calstart, a public-private partnership dedicated to the creation of an advanced transportation industry, serves as a perfect example of what these funds should be spent on. Calstart has already made great strides toward encouraging defense contractors to diversify into areas of high technology and encouraging the utilization of the specialized skills of displaced defense workers.

Unfortunately, even if the House provision for increased defense conversion funding prevails, we will be far short of funding even one-eighth of all of the worthy defense conversion proposals already on the table. DOD's technology reinvestment project has received 3,000 proposals requesting \$9 billion in Government contributions. All of these proposals contain 50 percent local cost share commitments. There is no money to spare. If anything we should be increasing defense conversion accounts.

The United States does not suffer from a competitive disadvantage that

would somehow necessitate the robbing of defense conversion money for arms exports. In fact, the United States has increased both its market share and volume of arms sales. The United States alone now supplies almost 60 percent of all sales to the developing world.

The Andrews-Kasich amendment does not, in any way, limit legitimate foreign arms transfers from taking place. Nor does it impact the export of commercial or dual-use items. The amendment specifically states that the Secretary may exempt the sale or transfer of defense articles or defense services for civilian end-use.

The amendment simply makes sure that defense conversion funds are used for one purpose: defense conversion.

We urge your support on this amendment.

□ 1650

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY].

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Andrews-Kasich amendment and believe it makes sound logic and that we ought to pass it.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Andrews amendment. This is a great moral issue. We are on the cutting edge of significant policy here. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan Andrews-Kasich amendment and urge its adoption.

The Andrews-Kasich amendment would prohibit the financing of arms sales from defense conversion funding. Emphatically, diverting defense conversion dollars for this purpose is not defense conversion.

I think it is vital that the House understand that this amendment is intended to engage a larger issue of how politically and morally we address the problem of supporting arms sales from which we may derive economic benefit at great human cost. Regrettably, in an effort to offset declining defense markets at home, we are scrambling to increase weapons sales abroad. Importantly, we must cope with the emergency of a global-military industrial complex. Defense conversion in the post-cold war era now has become an international issue which this Congress will have to consider in the years ahead.

The Andrews-Kasich amendment is therefore an important statement of principle with respect to the very important issue as to how we support the continued economic viability of defense-dependent sectors of our economy without fueling arms races abroad or impeding defense conversion, reinvestment, and diversification efforts at home. This amendment will also protect the limited funding provided in

H.R. 2401 to support loan guarantees for small and medium-sized diversification into nondefense markets and the national shipbuilding initiative loan guarantee program established for commercial ship construction.

The Andrews-Kasich amendment will preserve the opportunity for all committees of the House with jurisdiction over various aspects of financing weapons sales abroad to review issues with respect to arms proliferation, potential American job losses resulting from offset agreements required to gain foreign approval of weapons sales, relationship of U.S. arms export financing to overall international trade strategy and other related issues.

Currently, the administration is reviewing the types of mechanisms and circumstances which might be appropriate to support Government financing of arms sales. The Andrews-Kasich amendment does not preclude the establishment and support of an export financing facility at some point once the issues indicated above are resolved. However, it is clearly inconsistent to provide such financing from weapons sales from defense conversion funds. The Andrews-Kasich amendment seeks to establish this very important commonsense principle with which we should all agree.

Finally, on August 31, 1993, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition released a letter to the Los Angeles Times stating that defense conversion funding would not be utilized to finance weapons sales abroad. Clearly, the Andrews-Kasich amendment is consistent with this stated policy and I urge its adoption.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I hope that the Members of this Chamber will look at the facts against the fiction that we have been hearing on the other side as to what this amendment will do and will not do. This is not going to cost jobs, it will create jobs.

Ladies and gentlemen, we sell more arms to the Third World than all other nations of the world combined. American young people put in harm's way in Desert Storm, in Somalia, in Panama, have found themselves looking down the barrel of American-made weapons and American-weapons technology. Meanwhile, thousands and thousands of sound proposals for real defense conversion, which can take our industrial base and put it to work to rebuild this country's economic greatness, go unfunded because we do not have the resources.

This amendment clearly states, and only states, the defense conversion funds will be used for defense conversion, period. Arms sales, foreign arms sales, there are other resources and sources of funds for that. It is not conversion.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I want to make one statement: For all the rhetoric we have heard from those members of the Committee on Appropriations, I remind my colleagues that \$7 billion a year in the foreign aid

appropriations bill goes to arms sales. Why don't you offer this amendment on the foreign aid bill? That is where I suggest this debate should occur, not the way it is being offered here.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of our time to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I might say this is an unemployment amendment. Let us not be mistaken about that. This amendment does not say to use defense conversion for defense conversion. The amendment says you cannot finance the sale of defense articles. That includes nuts and bolts and brass and paint and composites. What type of bureaucracy will you need to investigate whether someone's nuts and bolts go into defense articles?

This does not make sense. How many people are you going to have to put on the Federal payroll to create a bureaucracy to check into seeing whether every piece of paint or composite or screw or nut or bolt goes into something to make a defense article?

It just does not make sense.

I intend to vote against it.

Mr. BATEMAN. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. Chairman, in the few seconds remaining to me, let me say to my colleagues that most of the debate that I have heard on behalf of this amendment is something appropriate to something other than the amendment which has been proposed. This amendment will have absolutely zero effect upon the amount of arms distributed and sold in the world community in which we live. It will not impact the quantity; it will only say that no American jobs will be created or preserved because some of that equipment or more of that equipment is going to be American equipment. The chart that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] pointed to, the 1985 blip where Western European arms sales went up so high, why did they go up so high? Because we did not sell something to the Saudia Arabians that they bought from the French and the British. They bought it, it was equally almost as good as ours. They bought it, but it did not reduce the inflow of arms to the Middle East. This bill would not do so. This is totally a red-herring. It will do nothing but deprive American workers of the opportunity to retain their jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a vote against it.

Mr. HAMBURG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Andrews-Kasich amendment to ban the use of defense conversion funds for financing foreign arms sales.

We have seen an ingenious lobbying campaign by Raytheon and other top military contractors to underwrite arms sales in an attempt

to compensate for reductions in the defense budget. They are attempting to divert money from true defense conversion efforts to pay for more than \$5 billion in loan guarantees for foreign arms sales.

I say to my colleagues this is not conversion. Defense conversion means a fundamental shift from a defense-based to a civilian-based economy. Financing arms sales to keep defense companies producing the same weapons of war is not conversion. Finding new markets for our weapons is not conversion. This policy destabilizes our fragile industrial base; it does not face the reality that the global economy is changing.

I question whether we should be financing foreign arms sales at all. If we look across the globe at the troubled spots of the world—Somalia and the Middle East in particular—we see one pattern that has fueled wars and tensions in those regions: a large supply of easily obtainable weapons. President Clinton shares this concern. In a recent response to a congressional letter about arms sales policy, he declared his intention to undertake a comprehensive review of arms transfers.

If we are ever to achieve any semblance of world peace and stability, as well as economic strength here at home, we must move beyond our cold war mentality. Vote for sanity; vote for the Andrews-Kasich amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). Under the rule, all time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ANDREWS].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 256, noes 160, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 422]

AYES—256

Abercrombie	Carr	Eshoo
Allard	Chapman	Evans
Andrews (ME)	Clay	Faleomavaega
Andrews (NJ)	Clayton	(AS)
Applegate	Clement	Farr
Baessler	Clyburn	Fawell
Ballenger	Coleman	Fazio
Barca	Collins (GA)	Fields (LA)
Barcia	Collins (IL)	Filner
Barlow	Collins (MI)	Fingerhut
Barrett (NE)	Condit	Fish
Barrett (WI)	Coppersmith	Flake
Becerra	Costello	Foglietta
Bellenson	Coyne	Ford (MI)
Bentley	Crane	Frank (MA)
Bereuter	Danner	Franks (NJ)
Berman	de Lugo (VI)	Furse
Billrakis	Deal	Gallo
Bishop	DeFazio	Gejdenson
Blackwell	DeLauro	Gephardt
Boehert	Dellums	Gibbons
Bonior	Derrick	Gilchrist
Borski	Deutsch	Gilman
Brewster	Dixon	Glickman
Brooks	Dooley	Gonzalez
Brown (CA)	Duncan	Gordon
Brown (FL)	Dunn	Grams
Brown (OH)	Durbin	Grandy
Bryant	Edwards (CA)	Green
Byrne	Engel	Greenwood
Cantwell	English (AZ)	Gunderson
Cardin	English (OK)	Hall (OH)

Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinche
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Klecza
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lantos
LaRocco
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Margolies-
Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsul
Mazzoli

McCloskey
McCurdy
McHale
McInnis
McKinney
McMillan
Meehan
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Romero-Barcelo
(PR)
Rostenkowski
Roth

Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Studds
Sweet
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Towns
Traffant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volker
Washington
Waters
Watt
Wheat
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Zimmer

Pombo
Quillen
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rowland
Santorum
Sarpaluis
Schaefer
Scott
Shaw
Shays
Shuster

Sistisky
Skeen
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Talent
Tauszn

Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Valentine
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Whitten
Wilson
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—22

Ackerman
Bliley
Conyers
Cooper
de la Garza
Ford (TN)
Gutierrez
Hastert

Hayes
Hyde
Johnson (CT)
Lehman
McDermott
Neal (NC)
Skeltion
Smith (IA)

Stokes
Thomas (CA)
Vucanovich
Waxman
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 1715

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Ackerman for, with Mr. Thomas of California against.

□ 1715

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mrs. FOWLER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. RICHARDSON, BISHOP, DERRICK, MOAKLEY, GEPHARDT, and Mrs. BENTLEY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent earlier today during the rollcall votes 419 and 422. I was unavoidably detained in a health care reform meeting.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 419 and "no" on rollcall 422.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part 4 of House Report 103-223.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER:

Page 367, line 14, insert "(a) FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994.—".

Page 368, strike out lines 7 through 18, relating to funds available for manufacturing extension programs under section 2523 of title 10, United States Code and for the defense dual-use extension program under section 2524 of such title.

Page 368, line 19, strike out "(7)" and insert in lieu thereof "(5)".

Page 368, after line 22, add the following new subsection:

(b) REDUCTION IN TRP FUNDING.—The amount provided in subsection (a) to be available for activities of the Department of Defense under chapter 148 of title 10, United

States Code, and section 2197 of such title is hereby reduced by \$300,000,000.

Page 372, line 4, strike out "or" and insert in lieu thereof "and".

Page 372, line 6, strike out "section 2501" and insert in lieu thereof "section 2501(a)".

Page 373, line 11, strike out "section 2501" and insert in lieu thereof "section 2501(a)".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member in opposition, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the intent of this amendment is to authorize the Technology Reinvestment Program [TRP] at President Clinton's budget request. This is the House's first real test to help the President hold the line on spending since the passage of the tax bill where we talked so much about the need for that. President Clinton has said that he wants \$275 million in fiscal year 1994 funding for the TRP, not the \$575 billion that is represented in this bill. Now that was \$300 million that was added in committee to the grant program.

Mr. Chairman, I understood a little while ago the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] to say the President is now for this \$300 million more. I guess what we have to figure out is just what the President is for at any given time. The budget numbers say \$275 million. That is the predication on which the whole defense cut was based, was on the fact that what we were going to do was have real savings in the defense appropriations. I am simply trying to make certain that the President gets the money that he originally requested, not the add-on money that the committee has put into this particular program.

Now I think that it is important also to look at this amendment from the standpoint of how the money is going to be spent because that is the real, real, question here, is whether or not this money is going to be well used if you give it an additional \$200 million. Remember there is about \$500 million in carryover money already available in this program, and so it is not as though the money is going to be starved in any way for this program, and the question is: How well is the \$300 million going to be used?

Mr. Chairman, there is a very serious consideration with regard to the money being spent because Members should know that a large share of the money that will come out of this particular defense spending item will actually be transferred to the Commerce Department for inclusion in their extension programs. One of the Commerce Department industrial grant programs is the advanced technology

NOES—160

Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bacchus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bevill
Bilbray
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Boucher
Browder
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Combest
Cox
Cramer
Crapo
Cunningham
Darden
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell

Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gekas
Ceren
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Ingalls
Inhofe
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
King
Kingston
Kolbe

Kyl
Lancaster
Laughlin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Mann
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDughe
McKeon
McNulty
Meek
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Molinar
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle

program known as ATP. That is the kind of program that we are going to get here. The GAO on September 3 gave us a report about what is happening in the advanced technology program, and what we found is that of 16 ATP grantees, they had incorrect costs of over 100 percent, 4 had rates of over 200 percent, and 1 of those was as high as 250 percent.

What does that mean?

□ 1720

It means that the indirect costs, the overhead costs, are being charged off to government, and we are not getting technology out of these programs.

What is happening here is that the overhead, the administrative costs, the facilities, and heaven knows what else, are being written off to the Government, and out of these programs we are not getting technological development. So what the effect of my amendment is is to say that the \$300 million ought to be kept for things like helping communities.

We are not taking this money away. We are keeping it in defense conversion. But it ought to go to communities that need the help. It ought to go to other programs in defense conversion. It ought not go into programs where GAO is now ready to certify that the money is being poorly used and we are not getting new technology.

Mr. Chairman, in my view, this is an attempt to make certain that if we are going to spend money on defense conversion, that it ought to be well spent. These new technological programs are not going to result. The fact is we have not spent the money that was there from last year. We got \$500 million.

I understand that one of the issues is that there is \$8 billion out there of people that want to use this program. That is exactly what we heard on ATP, and ATP did not try to fund all of those programs. What ATP did was went out and took the best of them. What is happening in the best of them? What we are finding is they are charging off massive overhead costs to the Federal Government, and we are not producing technological results.

So if you think that you have got a problem there, I think you had better really examine what is happening here, because this is \$300 million of money that has not been justified in any way, shape, or form. It was \$300 million that was dumped in the committee without any idea of what this is going to be used for, other than the fact that there are 8 billion dollars' worth of people out there that want some money.

Mr. Chairman, you can always find 8 billion dollars' worth of people that want money. They are around everywhere. The question is whether or not the money will be well used.

In my view, this is money that will not be well used. It would be better used somewhere else in defense conver-

sion. I would suggest to the House that this is a good place to support the President's original figure.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]. I hope the gentleman would look at page 348, because we specifically address what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman specifically addressed the overhead costs?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thirty million dollars.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The Chair would announce that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] has 10 minutes remaining in opposition to the amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I am regretfully going to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], which would strike \$300 million from the committee's bill.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is quite familiar with these programs. We have worked together on them in the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology for several years, and we have tried to create a program similar to what is in this bill in the Department of Commerce under the Advanced Technology Program. Actually the Advanced Technology Program, on which this is based, was adopted in the foreign trade bill in 1988 and signed by President Reagan.

What some people object to, including the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], is the buildup of funding for this program, for the kinds of legitimate reasons that the gentleman has expressed: it is a new program, and it is possibly subject to abuse.

Nevertheless, in the authorizing legislation that we have already passed, the competitiveness bill, in the Commerce Department this program will wrap up to half a billion dollars or more over the next few years. This program, in defense, will not. It will go down, as a matter of fact.

What the two together do is give us a reasonable base from which we can begin to build a program of cooperation between government and industry that will help us to move through this transition period between the defense turn-down and the buildup of a more effective program of cooperation between government and industry.

The \$300 million reduction, I think, would be tragic. The Senate has already approved a \$515 million program in the committee, and we expect that they will come to conference with that. We would be at a severe disadvantage if this amendment is approved.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Walker amendment. I rise in strong support of the TRP program. I worked within Pennsylvania to establish a major conference with my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], to bring in industry and business, to work on ways that we could develop new technologies, and to create jobs in our region.

Mr. Chairman, but I am also very much concerned about how much money we throw, and I say throw, before we really have looked at the way we are spending the money that has already been allocated.

We do not have money just to throw out there. The President requested \$275 million. This takes it an additional \$300 million beyond that, and it funds programs that we have not used the money there from last year. As we have heard, GAO said that less than 25 percent of the allocation from last year is actually being used.

Mr. Chairman, what I am very much concerned about is, we are looking at the TRP to become the solution to all of our problems, when the major problem is cutting defense over 5 years, which is going to cost us 2.8 million real jobs out of a total 5.5 million people in the work force.

What I am also worried about is this becoming the cash cow, the defense bill becoming the cash cow for everyone. What do I mean by that? Well, in committee I would tell you the TRP process was very strictly defined so that we actually earmarked money for certain programs that had nothing to do with defense.

We were able to change that. Our side offered an amendment, which the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] agreed to accept, which the committee accepted, that removed those barriers. The amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] takes it one step further and says we must use this money for defense-related technology, and not become the cash cow for everybody who wants to go out and have their company feel that they are delivering the goods back home. And that is what we are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to support the Walker amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Ms. HARMAN], a member of the committee.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to recognize first the leadership of the

gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] on this issue. No one has contributed more to developing the TRP than she has.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Walker amendment. This amendment would reverse one of the most proactive measures in the defense authorization bill: Increased funding for the Technology Reinvestment Project. As a Representative of one of the areas of the country that has been hardest hit by defense downsizing, I think this measure would send exactly the wrong signal to companies that are trying to diversify into important new industries, and could send thousands of our highest skilled workers to the unemployment lines.

As we debate this bill, the Clinton administration's 6-agency team is judging more than 2,700 proposals that were submitted to round one of the TRP this past July. Hundreds of those proposals were submitted by California companies. These applications covered technologies ranging from advanced batteries to health care systems to green manufacturing processes. The TRP has \$471 million in fiscal year 1993 money to fund the best of these applications; it has 8.4 billion dollars' worth of proposals to choose from.

Every one of these proposals has two important features. First, companies have teamed with other firms, universities, national laboratories, and Government agencies to share ideas and resources. Second, every application requires that the sponsors put up half the money. The TRP is not a handout—it is Government as catalyst and as partner, working with companies that want to put intellectual and industrial resources to work on challenging non-defense priorities. It is market driven and merit based, and it is the leading edge of defense diversification.

I oppose the Walker amendment because it threatens to cut the TRP off at the knees just as it gets under way. Projects that are funded under the TRP this fall will receive only a year's worth of support, even though they are seeking to develop new technologies that may take years to prove out. The Armed Services Committee increased funding for the TRP by \$300 million in fiscal year 1994 because Members did not want to have to deny funding for promising technologies after just 1 year's worth of work. The Walker amendment would make it much more likely that some projects will be only a flash in the pan, not because they don't work but because the Government can't see them through.

Mr. Chairman, my office received an overwhelming response to the first round of the TRP. Dozens of companies have sent their ideas and their proposals to me, and have visited Washington to show their commitment to diversification. Not every defense contractor is interested in seeking new mar-

kets, and that's fine. But I think it would be tragic to reward companies that do want to move into new industries by leaving them hanging when they have just committed their talent, money, and resources. We need these companies to help maintain and strengthen our industrial base and the high skill, high wage jobs on which it depends, and they want to do so. I urge all of my colleagues who believe in defense diversification to reject the Walker amendment.

□ 1730

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard some interesting arguments against this amendment. It seems to me that we need to be very cautious about what we hear.

The gentleman from California, my friend, who is chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, indicated to us that President Clinton is going to ramp down this program, that this program is one of those which is supposed to be dropping in the defense area. The fact is that President Clinton is trying to do this with the \$275 million appropriation here, and the committee is determined to ramp it up. In fact, the gentlewoman offered an amendment a little bit ago that she wanted to add even more money to this program.

The gentleman from Massachusetts added even more money in an amendment he had. They wanted to put an extra billion dollars over and above the \$500 million that is already there. In other words, we are at \$575 million. They were going to, if we take both of their amendments together, they wanted to go to \$1.5 billion for this program. That is not ramping down. That is ramping up, exactly the opposite direction from where the Clinton administration wants to go. So these Members are arguing against their own President and making it very clear that their own President does not know what he is talking about.

Also, let me make another point; that is, that the gentlewoman from California told us about half the money goes from the companies themselves. This bill changes that for small businesses down to 30 percent. So already they are moving away from that as a criteria.

Second, I tell Members, that is not really money that they have to put up. It is in-kind money. That is exactly what the GAO said was causing the waste, fraud, and abuse in the ATP

Program. They are putting up in-kind money, and then what they are doing is charging off all the overhead to the Federal Government. That is the reason why we now have 250-percent overruns in overhead to the Federal Government.

So what we are doing, when we endorse that as a concept, is we are encouraging the waste, fraud, and abuse that we are already seeing in this program.

What we have is arguments today that argue two different directions. First of all, they argue that they do not want to do what the Clinton administration wants to do and, second, what they argue is that they want to continue the pattern that ATP is already showing results in waste, fraud and abuse in these programs.

I would suggest that the House wants to prevent itself from the embarrassment of having voted to upgrade programs that are going to bring about more waste, fraud, and abuse. What we want to do is support the Walker amendment to assure that we get some good standards in these programs.

Do not support the arguments that we have heard already against this amendment, because the arguments against this amendment prove my point. That is, that this is a program that has major problems in it already and that they are going to continue those major problems.

The fact that we have got 8 billion dollars' worth of people out there who want money from the Federal Government, we can always find those people. If we have 2,700 applications, I am not surprised at that at all, particularly when they find out that they can charge off up to 250 percent of their expenses to the Federal Government. Sure, anybody wants in for that kind of free money. I do not think the taxpayers ought to have to pay it.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let us go through this one by one. I appreciate the gentleman having a wonderful pipeline to Clinton. I want to know when he last had his conversation with him, but I want to tell Members that the President has said very clearly he wants this \$300 million add on.

No. 2, I would like to point out that the next part is if the gentleman would have read page 348, he would have discovered that the thing that he is so concerned about, the advanced technology manufacturing partnership, is not added onto by this \$300 million. That was part of the administration's money that they requested, and only \$30 million goes to it, according to that. And that was in the \$275 million they asked for.

The \$300 million that the committee added to this came from one of the most exciting things that is going on. I feel a little silly down here arguing as

the capitalist, but anyone in this place who thinks they are a capitalist, who wants the American taxpayer to get something for the megabucks and gigabucks that they have invested in our research and development for our military, better vote no on this amendment, because they are not going to get it back otherwise.

Let me tell Members about how successful this TRP Program has been. When it went out, people did not think companies were going to apply. Most CEO's said, "No, we don't want to play; we want not to play."

But all sorts of people did apply, and we were absolutely overwhelmed by over almost 9 billion dollars' worth of Government share requests coming in.

The gentleman is saying how upset he is because some of this could be in kind. Yes, it could be, but none of them are going to be, I do not think, because we got over \$4 billion that are coming in that are cash, cold cash, cold American dollars in cash, 50 percent. So we have got between 3 and 4 billion dollars' worth of cold cash out there ready to go into America's infrastructure and ready to create new jobs, if we can only match it.

And what do we have to put up against that \$3 to \$4 billion? \$275 million.

Had we had vision and had we known how good it was going to be, we would have raised it way beyond the \$300 million. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, yes, I am proud of the fact I tried to add more money to that account. I am trying to add to it every way I can, because for everyone of those projects, the gentleman may not think it is a good deal, but there is a foreign investor somewhere on this planet drooling over that. What a deal.

They get all this wonderful research that American taxpayers have invested in. They will take it offshore. It is a 50-50 match. It is a great investment for any venture capitalist in this world, and they are ready to do it.

The gentleman from San Diego earlier on had talked about the bridge proposal there. I was telling him, the only other lab like that in the world is in Japan. They hope we turn this down. They hope we turn our back on this, because they are ready to take it. And they are ready to take the composite that we developed with taxpayer money here and turn it into a whole new way of how we rebuild infrastructure. And then we will start importing it, just like we did it over and over and over again.

I want to tell my colleagues, I cannot think of a more capitalist, entrepreneurial program than this one. If we are going to bet any money, we have got to put up half. We have had this terrific response in this whole area. And if we look at page 349 of the report, it will tell Members in which areas. They must come in ocean ther-

mal energy conversion or they must come in advanced antenna technology or noncooled, pyroelectric thermal imaging systems or advanced wind power systems.

I can go on and on and on. These are all things America needs. When we look at these proposals, they are amazing. They are taking the imaging that we have created and putting it into medical science. It will break through all sorts of things, if we do that.

They are doing all sorts of appliance to try and finally clean up the environment so we stop spending money.

But when we look at this, we have a very serious, serious matter of technologies that we have spent billions on, billions. And when we look at the past 12 years, the majority of America's investment has been in military research and development. If we do not figure out how to take this research and apply it to the civilian sector, the rest of the world is ready.

□ 1740

They are drooling. They are wringing their hands and standing at America's gate. I hope the Members vote "no" on this. If the Members do not vote "no", they are voting for the flat Earth caucus.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Walker amendment. As my colleagues know, the defense conversion title of the committee bill proposes \$575 million for fiscal year 1994 Technology Reinvestment Project [TRP] funding.

To date, nearly 3,000 proposals have been received requesting almost \$9 billion in Government support for defense conversion and reinvestment projects to develop and deploy technology for commercial as well as military application. Importantly, this program is market oriented by requiring proposers to cost-share with the Government. And it is competitive with the Congress designating technology focus areas, not technology winners or losers. We have reiterated the requirement in the bill this year that award of TRP funding be contingent upon competition.

Given the avalanche of interest in the TRP Program, it can be said that defense conversion is an idea whose time has come. Unfortunately, the Walker amendment seeks to turn back the clock.

The Walker amendment would retard our current efforts in at least two ways.

First, it would reduce TRP by \$300 million, essentially gutting our capability to both continue the technology conversion program or fund a significant share of worthy proposals. I should add that during his recent trip to Alameda, CA, the President was clearly pleased with the action by our committee in increasing TRP funding by \$300 million.

Second, it would descope the objectives supported by the committee bill by allowing defense conversion funds to be used only for uniquely defense technology development to support a warmaking capability. It would prevent funding for projects to achieve policy objectives relating to defense reinvestment, diversification and conversion as well as the in-

tegration of the civilian and military industrial base.

On both counts, the Walker amendment should be defeated because it is out of step with the economic conversion needs of our Nation. Ironically, it would also obstruct the military from taking advantage of developments in commercial technology by abandoning the civil-military integration goals of the Defense Conversion, Reinvestment and Transition Assistance Act of 1992.

As a Member of Congress who has been intensely interested in the requirement of this Nation to put forward a defense economic conversion agenda, I must also say that adoption of the Walker amendment will put us further out of touch with the requirements of our economic security. It will only continue to delay our defense conversion efforts and postpone our ability to redeploy our best minds, hands and talents in support of a truly national economic strategy to benefit all of our people.

Continued defense production is not the path to America's future prosperity. Utilizing all of the resources of the Nation's technology base—including those resident in DOD—toward reinvestment and economic conversion of our defense industrial and technology complex is the path we should choose.

The current defense conversion plan put forward by President Clinton last March was a welcome step in the right direction to deal with the economic consequences of the defense build-down. But we must not view it as merely an economic adjustment program; it should be seen as an initiative to convert attitudes about what is possible when government works in partnership with its workers, communities, and firms. Much more can and should be done. However, we cannot build on the current program if the foundations are removed. That is what the Walker amendment attempts to do and it should be resoundingly defeated. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Walker amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Under the rule, all debate on this amendment is completed.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 151, noes 261, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 423]

AYES—151

Andrews (TX)	Bateman	Camp
Archer	Bereuter	Canady
Armey	Billakis	Castle
Bachus (AL)	Boehner	Clement
Baker (CA)	Bonilla	Clinger
Baker (LA)	Brewster	Coble
Ballenger	Bunning	Collins (GA)
Barca	Burton	Combest
Barrett (NE)	Buyer	Costello
Bartlett	Callahan	Cox
Barton	Calvert	Crane

Crapo	Johnson, Sam	Pryce (OH)	Mink	Romero-Barcelo	Synar
Cunningham	Kasich	Quillen	Moakley	(PR)	Tanner
DeLay	Kim	Ramstad	Mollohan	Rose	Tauzin
Diaz-Balart	King	Ravenel	Montgomery	Rostenkowski	Taylor (MS)
Doolittle	Kingston	Regula	Moran	Rowland	Tejeda
Dornan	Klug	Ridge	Morella	Roybal-Allard	Thompson
Dreier	Knollenberg	Roberts	Murtha	Rush	Thornton
Duncan	Kolbe	Rogers	Sabo	Sanders	Thurman
Dunn	Kyl	Rohrabacher	Natcher	Sanders	Torkildsen
Emerson	Leach	Ros-Lehtinen	Neal (MA)	Sangmeister	Torres
Everett	Levy	Roth	Norton (DC)	Santor	Torricelli
Ewing	Lewis (CA)	Roukema	Oberstar	Sarpalius	Towns
Fawell	Lewis (FL)	Royce	Obey	Sawyer	Trafilant
Fields (TX)	Lightfoot	Saxton	Oliver	Schenk	Tucker
Fowler	Linder	Schaefer	Ortiz	Schiff	Underwood (GU)
Franks (NJ)	Livingston	Sensenbrenner	Owens	Schroeder	Unsoeld
Gekas	Manzullo	Shaw	Pallone	Schumer	Valentine
Gillmor	McCandless	Shays	Parker	Scott	Velazquez
Gilman	McCollum	Shuster	Pastor	Serrano	Vento
Gingrich	McDade	Skeen	Payne (NJ)	Sharp	Visclosky
Goodlatte	McInnis	Smith (MI)	Payne (VA)	Shepherd	Volkmer
Goodling	McKeon	Smith (NJ)	Pelosi	Sisk	Walsh
Goss	McMillan	Smith (OR)	Penny	Skaggs	Washington
Grams	Meyers	Smith (TX)	Peterson (FL)	Skelton	Waters
Grandy	Mica	Solomon	Peterson (MN)	Slattery	Watt
Greenwood	Michael	Spence	Pickett	Slaughter	Waxman
Gunderson	Miller (FL)	Stearns	Pomeroy	Snowe	Wheat
Hancock	Mollinari	Stump	Price (NC)	Spratt	Whitten
Hansen	Moorhead	Sundquist	Quinn	Stark	Williams
Hastert	Myers	Talent	Rahall	Stenholm	Wilson
Hefley	Nussle	Taylor (NC)	Rangel	Strickland	Wise
Herger	Orton	Thomas (WY)	Reed	Studds	Wolf
Hobson	Oxley	Upton	Reynolds	Stupak	Woolsey
Hoekstra	Packard	Walker	Richardson	Sweet	Wyden
Hoke	Paxon	Weldon	Roemer	Swift	Wynn
Huffington	Petri	Young (FL)			
Hunter	Pombo	Zelliff			
Inglis	Porter	Zimmer			
Inhofe	Portman				
Istook	Poshard				

NOES—261

Abercrombie	Dingell	Inslee
Andrews (ME)	Dixon	Jacobs
Andrews (NJ)	Dooley	Jefferson
Applegate	Durbin	Johnson (CT)
Bacchus (FL)	Edwards (CA)	Johnson (GA)
Baesler	Edwards (TX)	Johnson (SD)
Barcia	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Barlow	English (AZ)	Johnston
Barrett (WI)	English (OK)	Kanjorski
Becerra	Eshoo	Kaptur
Beilenson	Evans	Kennedy
Bentley	Faleomavaega	Kennelly
Berman	(AS)	Kildee
Bevill	Farr	Kleczka
Bilbray	Fazio	Klein
Bishop	Fields (LA)	Klink
Blackwell	Filner	Kopetski
Blute	Fingerhut	Kreidler
Boehlert	Fish	LaFalce
Bonior	Flake	Lambert
Borski	Foglietta	Lancaster
Boucher	Ford (MI)	Lantos
Brooks	Frank (MA)	LaRocco
Browder	Franks (CT)	Laughlin
Brown (CA)	Frost	Lazio
Brown (FL)	Furse	Levin
Brown (OH)	Gallo	Lewis (GA)
Byrne	Gejdenson	Lipinski
Cantwell	Gephardt	Lloyd
Cardin	Geren	Long
Carr	Gibbons	Lowe
Chapman	Gilchrest	Machtley
Clay	Glickman	Maloney
Clayton	Gonzalez	Mann
Clyburn	Gordon	Margolies-
Coleman	Green	Mezvinsky
Collins (IL)	Hall (OH)	Markley
Collins (MI)	Hall (TX)	Martinez
Condit	Hamburg	Matsui
Coppersmith	Hamilton	Mazzoli
Coyne	Harman	McCloskey
Cramer	Hastings	McCurdy
Danner	Hefner	McHale
Darden	Hilliard	McHugh
de Lugo (VI)	Hinchee	McKinney
Deal	Hoagland	McNulty
DeFazio	Hochbrueckner	Meehan
DeLauro	Holden	Meek
Dellums	Horn	Menendez
Derrick	Houghton	Mfume
Deutsch	Hoyer	Miller (CA)
Dickey	Hughes	Mineta
Dicks	Hutchinson	Minge

NOT VOTING—26

Ackerman	Gutierrez	Neal (NC)
Allard	Hayes	Pickle
Bliley	Hutto	Smith (IA)
Bryant	Hyde	Stokes
Conyers	Lehman	Thomas (CA)
Cooper	Manton	Vucanovich
de la Garza	McCrery	Yates
Ford (TN)	McDermott	Young (AK)
Gallegly	Murphy	

□ 1750

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McCrery for, with Mr. Ackerman against.

Mr. Thomas of California for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Mrs. Vucanovich for, with Mr. Stokes against.

Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. PENNY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. KIM changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of a provision in H.R. 2401, the Defense authorization bill, which would grant civilian employees in the Department of Defense important procedural rights when a security clearance is revoked or denied.

Section H.R. 943 of the bill requires the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations that would provide employees of the Department of Defense the same procedural safeguards that are currently given to employees of defense contractors under Executive order 10865. This change is long overdue.

Over 30 years ago, President Eisenhower signed Executive Order 10865, granting contractor employees due process rights when a final determination is made regarding a security clearance. There is no equivalent provision, either under Executive order, or by statute, that provides the same rights for Federal employees in the Department of Defense.

The purpose of section 943 is to provide a fair, uniform process in the Department of De-

fense before a final determination is made respecting a civilian employee's security clearance. The language in the bill is intended to simply give the same due process rights to civilian Department of Defense employees that contractor employees have held for over 30 years. It is a simple matter of fairness, and it in no way compromises national security to treat government employees the same as contractor employees.

The absence of statutory or Executive order authority defining the due process rights of Federal employees with respect to denials and revocations of security clearances has resulted in a patchwork of procedural rights for Federal employees throughout the Federal government. Different components of the Department of Defense apply different procedures to Federal employees. Some afford Federal employees the same rights as contractor employees, but most do not.

Although the Department of Defense has made efforts to address this issue on its own, adopting section 943 will end the disparity between contractor and civilian employees, and will result in more consistent criteria for security classification determinations.

One thing that is clear under the current system is that government employees receive fewer rights than do contractor employees, simply because of their status as Federal employees. Since many jobs in the Department of Defense are dependant on having a security clearance, it is critical that employees have a fair process for responding to allegations which might threaten their security clearance. Indeed, in some cases, jobs depend on it.

Under the current system, an employee could come to work one day only to be told that their security clearance had been indefinitely suspended pending an investigation. They are not notified as to why they are being investigated. They are not notified as to the substance of allegations that led to an investigation. They are not entitled to any information about their accuser—who might be anonymous—and the employee is not told how long the investigation will take. Sometimes these investigations go on for over a year, keeping the employee in limbo.

Once the clearance has been suspended, the employee can no longer perform their job function, and they might be reassigned to a menial job that requires no clearance while the investigation is pending. Oftentimes, employees are unwilling to wait out an indefinite investigation, and they simply give up their job before the investigation is completed.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, I have been contacted by civilian employees in the Department of Defense who have experienced this first hand. You can only imagine the fear and anxiety this causes, and how disruptive it is to real lives. Until civilian employees have the right to a hearing to respond to allegations made against them, this system will continue to be subject to manipulation.

The Department of Defense issues more security clearance to Federal employees than any other agency, accounting for about 90 percent of all security clearances in the Federal Government. In fiscal year 1992, over 570,000 civilian employees had security clearances granted by the Department of Defense.

In many cases, Government and contractor employees perform identical duties, and work side-by-side in the same work site, on the same projects, yet Federal workers are denied the same due process rights merely because of their status as Federal employees. It is time to end this anachronistic policy. Federal employees present no different security risk than contractor employees and deserve the same due process rights.

The procedures I am talking about—contained Executive Order 10865—are very reasonable. Section 3 of Executive Order 10865 provides the following protection for contractor employees before access to a specific security classification may be finally denied or revoked:

No. 1, a written statement of the reasons why his or her access authorization may be denied or revoked, which shall be as comprehensive and detailed as national security permits;

No. 2, a reasonable opportunity to reply in writing under oath or affirmation to the statement of reasons;

No. 3, after he or she has filed under oath or affirmation a written reply to the statement of reasons, the form and sufficiency of which may be prescribed by regulations issued by the head of the department concerned, an opportunity to appear personally before the head of the department concerned or his designees, for the purpose of supporting his or her eligibility for access authorization and to present evidence on his or her behalf;

No. 4, a reasonable time to prepare for that appearance;

No. 5, an opportunity to be represented by counsel;

No. 6, an opportunity to cross-examine persons either orally or through written interrogatories in accordance with section 4 of Executive Order 10865 on matters not relating to the characterization in the statement of reasons of any organization or individual other than the applicant; and

No. 7, a written notice of the final decision in his or her case which, if adverse, shall specify whether the head of the department or his designees, including but not limited to, those officials named in section 8 of E.O. 10865, found for or against him or her with respect to each allegation in the statement of reasons.

The language in section 943 would apply identical procedures to civilian Department of Defense employees.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Civil Service held a joint hearing with the Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights on May 5, 1993, on the subject of due process rights of Federal employees with respect to decisions affecting security clearances. The subcommittees heard testimony from the General Accounting Office, top security officials in the Department of Defense and the Department of State, and Federal employee unions.

Testimony given at the hearing made clear that the Government's security classification system has grown increasingly complex since its origin, and that there is a need to address the rights of employees in a more comprehensive and coherent way.

The country has strong national security reasons for a security classification system,

and sensitivity to national security should permeate the process by which the Government controls access to classified information. However, consistent with these national security concerns, it is possible to provide Federal employees who require access to classified information to perform their jobs with a fair and consistent procedure to respond to and address any allegations that might arise affecting their access.

The provision in section 943 of the Defense authorization bill is a step in the right direction, and would improve our policy for Department of Defense employees establishing a fair, workable and uniform policy for civilian and contractor employees in the department.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Defense Authorization Act makes changes in the requirements for notice to contractors, subcontractors, employees and affected units of local government when proposed or actual terminations in defense programs occur. This is a clarification of legislative intent of what became law in section 4471 of the Defense Conversion, Reinvestment, and Transition Assistance Act of 1992. These clarifications were developed in consultation with the Department of Defense and the Education and Labor Committee.

As a result of these clarifications, each year in conjunction with the President's budget for the next fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense and Energy shall assess which defense programs, if any, in their jurisdictions are proposed to be terminated or substantially reduced in the budget. As soon as practicable after the budget is submitted, but not later than 180 days after such date, each Secretary shall notify each affected prime contractor of such proposed termination or substantial reduction. That notice must also be published in the Federal Register.

Once the Appropriations Acts pursuant to the President's budget are enacted, the Secretaries of Defense and Energy are required again to evaluate which of their programs would be terminated or reduced. Once that evaluation has occurred, notice shall be provided to each prime contractor, the Secretary of Labor, and through publication in the Federal Register.

In these cases, the contractor must then provide notice to major subcontractors.

Under this provision, the contractors and subcontractors receiving the above notice may not terminate the employment of an individual as a result of such actual terminations or substantial reductions until six months after the date on which the contractor or subcontractor provides written notice of the intent to terminate such individual. That notice must be provided to each individual, to the State dislocated worker unit under the Job Training Partnership Act, and to the chief elected local official of the unit of government in which the individual resides.

Such notice to individuals defined above will constitute the determination for such employees for the purposes of eligibility for training, adjustment assistance and employment services under section 325 and 325A of the Job Training Partnership Act.

In addition to these changes, the Education and Labor Committee clarified the intent of section 4467(f)(1) of the 1992 Act, to ensure

that the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education shall receive priority by the Secretary of Defense for the direct transfer of both real and personal property under the control of the Secretary of Defense that is in surplus or in excess of current and projected requirements of the Department of Defense. This practice will occur notwithstanding title II of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and any other provision of law. This will permit programs serving the economically disadvantaged, such as Job Corps, to receive this property free of charge for use in its activities.

Also included is important legislation originally introduced by Representative PELOSI which provides grants to institutions of higher education to provide education and training in environmental restoration to dislocated defense workers and young adults.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to elaborate and explain the unique situation we have in Hawaii regarding ceded lands. At the end of this statement I will insert for the record an excellent historical summary of the State of Hawaii and its ceded lands prepared by the Congressional Research Service. I would like to highlight this summation and explain my efforts in the House Armed Services Committee.

As far back as 1898 in the Act of Cession and Annexation the most important constraints on the disposition of Federal land holdings in Hawaii were imposed by: First, the declaration that Federal land holdings in Hawaii were "not subject to Federal laws concerning public lands then existing," and second, the assertion that "Congress would enact special laws for their management and disposition." Thus, from the earliest act creating the Territory of Hawaii, Congress set the precedent of making special laws concerning Federal land holdings in Hawaii.

Then in 1920 Congress passed the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act which set aside available lands as Hawaiian Homelands. This act created the Hawaiian Home Commission. These lands, as defined by the act, were to be leased to and for the benefit of native Hawaiians.

Any lands not leased by the Hawaiian Homes Commission were to resume status as public lands. As public lands they would come under the auspices of the State of Hawaii.

The Admissions Act of 1959 created the State of Hawaii and granted it title to all public property within the boundaries of the State at the time of admission except:

Lands set aside pursuant to law for the use of the United States under any Act of Congress, Executive order, Presidential proclamation, or proclamations of the Governor of Hawaii.

The Admissions Act went on to state that within 5 years each Federal agency having control over any land or property retained by the United States pursuant to this section shall report to the President the facts regarding the continued need for such land or property, and if the President determines that the "land or property is no longer needed by the United States it shall be conveyed to the State of Hawaii."

Further, the lands granted to the State of Hawaii by this section, and lands conveyed to

the State, "shall be held in public trust for the support of the public schools and other public educational institutions, [and] for the betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians as defined by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act as amended."

On June 12, 1961, Attorney General Robert Kennedy responded to a request for an interpretation of section 5 of the Hawaii Statehood Act which required the Federal Government to identify lands no longer needed for any Federal purpose and to transfer title of those lands to the State of Hawaii.

The specific question addressed by the Attorney General was whether property acquired by the United States—for example, through purchase or condemnation—after the date of annexation was subject to the requirements of the Statehood Act.

The Attorney General characterized property acquired by the United States under the Resolution of Cession and Annexation as ceded property. In his ruling regarding lands acquired after annexation the Attorney General affirmed the "congressional purpose to convey to the State of Hawaii and its subdivisions the ceded property and territorial property * * * and as much of the territorial and ceded property which had been set aside as would not be required by the United States * * * and therefore could be returned to the State of Hawaii."

As time went by and 5 years came to a close since passage of the Admissions Act, Congress further amended the Admissions Act by passing the Revision of Procedures of the Conveyance of Certain Lands to the State of Hawaii. (Public Law 88-223) The Revision Act stated that after August 21, 1964 "whenever ceded lands are determined to be surplus property by the head of the department or agency exercising administration or control over such lands and property they shall be conveyed to the State of Hawaii."

The act goes on to outline how the lands or property should be conveyed and that these lands should then be considered a part of the public trust established by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920. Thus, ceded lands no longer needed and then returned to the State are then to be administered as Hawaiian Homeland under the Hawaiian Homes Act.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this clarifies the process of disposing of ceded lands in the State of Hawaii. Dating back from the resolution of Cession and Annexation, Congress has stated that Federal lands in Hawaii are special and "that existing laws of the United States relative to public lands shall not apply to such Hawaiian Islands." The special and unique nature of these ceded lands has been affirmed through the 20th century by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, the Admission Act, Attorney General Kennedy's ruling, and the Revision Act.

All of these have determined that the lands set aside for the Federal Government should be returned to the State of Hawaii for the benefit of the native Hawaiian people.

Mr. Chairman, you can see that my efforts are not to cause disruption, but rather to give the Hawaiian people, through their elected representatives, a voice in protecting their rightful and lawful interest in Hawaii's ceded lands. This is a singular and special situation

applicable only to Hawaii. Because of the unique situation in Hawaii this proposal is the best way to provide for the national disposition of ceded lands while protecting the interests of native Hawaiians, the State of Hawaii and the Federal Government.

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
Washington, DC, June 9, 1992.

To: Hon. Neil Abercrombie.
From: American Law Division.
Subject: Constraints On The Disposition Of Federal Land Holdings In Hawaii Used By The Military, Especially As Applied To Transfers To The State Of Hawaii Or To A Political Subdivision Of Hawaii.

The United States Government owns land in many States of the Union, including in Hawaii. In general, dispositions of federally owned lands are subject to a variety of constraints imposed under federal law. There are, however, several constraints on dispositions of federally owned land which are unique to land situated in Hawaii. Those constraints imposed by federal law that are uniquely applicable to federal lands in Hawaii are examined in the discussion which follows. They are examined in chronological order.

RESOLUTION OF CESSATION AND ANNEXATION

Prior to European contacts, Hawaii had a monarchical form of government. The monarchy was overthrown and a Republic of Hawaii was created not long before Hawaii became a Territory of the United States. The transfer of sovereignty over the Hawaiian Islands from the Republic of Hawaii to the United States was accomplished through passage of the so-called "Newlands resolution," a joint resolution of the United States Congress more formally referred to as the Resolution of Cession and Annexation of the Hawaiian Islands as a Territory of the United States.¹

The relevant language included in the Resolution of Cession and Annexation is, as follows:

"Whereas the Government of the Republic of Hawaii having, in due form, signified its consent, in the manner provided by its constitution, to cede absolutely and without reserve to the United States of America . . . and transfer to the United States the absolute fee and ownership of all public, Government, or Crown lands, public buildings or edifices, ports, harbors, military equipment, and all other public property of every kind and description belonging to the Government of the Hawaiian Islands, together with every right and appurtenance thereunto appertaining: Therefore,

"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That said cession is accepted, ratified, and confirmed . . .

* * * * *

"The existing laws of the United States relative to public lands shall not apply to such lands in the Hawaiian Islands; but the Congress of the United States shall enact special laws for their management and disposition: *Provided*, That all revenue from or proceeds of the same, except as regards such part thereof as may be used or occupied for the civil, military, or naval purposes of the United States, or may be assigned for the use of the local government, shall be used solely for the benefit of the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands for educational and other public purposes."

It seems appropriate to identify the most important constraints on the disposition of

Footnotes at end of article.

federal land holdings in Hawaii stated in the foregoing language. The two most significant rules are (1) the declaration that federal land holdings in Hawaii were not subject to federal laws concerning public lands already then existing and (2) the assertion that Congress would enact "special laws for their [i.e., 'federal land holdings'] management and disposition."

HAWAIIAN ORGANIC ACT

The function served by so-called "organic acts" of United States Territories and Possessions is essentially the same as that served by the constitution in the case of a State of the Union. Fundamental law with respect to the organization of government, the separation and vesting of legislative, judicial, and executive powers, and general constraints on governmental authority are all set out under such laws. The organic act for the Territory of Hawaii² included relevant provisions to the following effect:

"SEC. 7. That the constitution of the Republic of Hawaii and the laws of Hawaii, as set forth in the following acts, chapters, and sections of the civil laws . . . relating to the following subjects are hereby repealed:

"CIVIL LAWS:

* * * * *

sections one hundred and sixty-six to one hundred and sixty-eight, inclusive, one hundred and seventy-four and one hundred and seventy-five, Government lands. . .

"SEC. 73. That the laws of Hawaii relating to public lands, the settlement of boundaries, and the issuance of patents on land-commission awards, except as changed by this Act, shall continue in force until Congress shall otherwise provide. That, subject to the approval of the President, all sales, grants, leases, and other dispositions of the public domain, and agreements concerning the same, and all franchises granted by the Hawaiian government in conformity with the laws of Hawaii between the seventh day of July, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight, and the twenty-eighth day of September, eighteen hundred and ninety-nine, are hereby ratified and confirmed.

* * * * *

"And no lease of agricultural land shall be granted, sold, or renewed by the government of the Territory of Hawaii for a longer period than five years until Congress shall otherwise direct. All funds arising from the sale or lease or other disposal of such lands shall be appropriated by the laws of the government of the Territory of Hawaii and applied to such uses and purposes for the benefit of the inhabitants of the Territory of Hawaii as are consistent with the joint resolution of annexation, approved July seventh, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight: *Provided*: There shall be excepted from the provisions of this section all lands heretofore set apart, or reserved, by Executive order, or orders, by the President of the United States."³

1904 OPINION OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

On July 23, 1904, the Attorney General responded to a question submitted by the Secretary of War asking whether the United States has acquired "complete" title to the Kahauiki Military Reservation on the Island of Oahu.⁴ Attorney General Moody first cited the Resolution of Cession and Annexation as having ceded and transferred to the United States "all public, Government, and Crown lands." He then cited a sundry appropriations Act of June 28, 1902, which included a paragraph making appropriations for "miscellaneous objects" of the War Department. That paragraph included a proviso to the effect that "the Secretary of War is authorized

to acquire leases in such lands in Hawaii as have been set aside for purposes of a military post.⁵ Finally, noting that the land in question had, evidently at the time of the cession and annexation, been public land leased to individuals and that the leases had subsequently been acquired by the Secretary of War, the Attorney General concluded that the United States' title to the lands was "now complete."

HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION ACT, 1920

The organic act for Hawaii was amended by legislation which created a so-called "Hawaiian Homes Commission."⁶ This legislation included numerous provisions relevant to the instant discussion. Among them are the following:

SEC. 203. All public lands of the description and acreage, as follows, excluding (a) all lands within any forest reservation, (b) all cultivated sugar-cane lands, and (c) all public lands held under a certificate of occupation, homestead lease, right of purchase lease, or special homestead agreement, are hereby designated, and hereinafter referred to, as "available lands";

[The follows here a list of numerous parcels of land.]

SEC. 204. Upon the passage of this Act all available lands shall immediately assume the status of Hawaiian home lands and be under the control of the commission to be used and disposed of in accordance with the provisions of this title, except that—

(1) For a period of five years . . . [only certain specified lands could be disposed of by the commission] . . . and none of the remaining available lands . . . shall, after the expiration of the said five-year period, be leased, used, or otherwise disposed of by the commission under the provisions of this title, except by further authorization of Congress and with the written approval of the Secretary of the Interior of the United States.

SEC. 207. (a) The commission is authorized to lease to native Hawaiians the right to the use and occupancy of a tract of Hawaiian home lands within the following acreage limits:

[There follow various descriptions of acreage limits.]

(b) The title to lands so leased shall remain in the United States.

SEC. 211. The commission shall, when practicable, provide from the Hawaiian home lands a community pasture adjacent to each district in which agriculture lands are leased, as authorized by the provisions of section 207 of this title.

SEC. 212. The Commission may return any Hawaiian home lands not leased . . . to the control of the commissioner of public lands. Any Hawaiian home lands so returned shall . . . resume and maintain the status of public lands in accordance with the provisions of the Hawaiian Organic Act and the Revised Laws of Hawaii of 1915, except that such lands may be disposed of under a general lease only.

SEC. 223. The Congress of the United States reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal the provisions of this title.

THE ADMISSION ACT

The Act providing for admission of Hawaii into the Union as a State⁷ included the following relevant language:

Sec. 4. As a compact with the United States relating to the management and disposition of the Hawaiian home lands, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, shall be adopted as a provision of the Constitution of said State . . . subject to amendment or repeal only with the consent of the United States, and in no other manner: *Provided*, That . . . (3) . . . all proceeds and income from the "available lands", as defined by said Act shall be used only in carrying out the provisions of said Act.

Sec. 5.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) and (d) of this section, the United States grants to the State of Hawaii, effective upon its admission into the Union, the United States' title to all the public lands and other public property within the boundaries of the State of Hawaii, title to which is held by the United States immediately prior to its admission into the Union. The grant hereby made shall be in lieu of any and all grants provided for new States by provisions of law other than this Act, and such grants shall not extend to the State of Hawaii.

(c) Any lands and other properties that, on the date Hawaii is admitted into the Union, are set aside pursuant to law for the use of the United States under any (1) Act of Congress, (2) Executive order, (3) proclamation of the President, or (4) proclamation of the Governor of Hawaii shall remain the property of the United States subject only to the limitations, if any, imposed under (1), (2), (3), or (4), as the case may be.

(d) Any public lands or other property that is conveyed to the State of Hawaii by subsection (b) of this section but that, immediately prior to the admission of said State into the Union, is controlled by the United States pursuant to permit, license, or permission, written or verbal, from the Territory of Hawaii or any department thereof may, at any time during the five years following the admission of Hawaii into the Union, be set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order of the President, made pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, and the lands or property so set aside shall, subject only to valid rights then existing, be the property of the United States.

(e) Within five years from the date Hawaii is admitted into the Union, each Federal agency having control over any land or property that is retained by the United States pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall report to the President the facts regarding its continued need for such land or property, and if the President determines that the land or property is no longer needed by the United States it shall be conveyed to the State of Hawaii.

(f) The lands granted to the State of Hawaii by . . . this section and public lands . . . later conveyed to the State . . . together with the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of any such lands and the income therefrom, shall be held by said State as a public trust for the support of the public schools and other public educational institutions, for the betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians, as defined in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, for the development of farm and home ownership on as widespread a basis as possible, for the making of public improvements, and for the provisions of lands for public use.

ACT AMENDING FEDERAL LAWS TO ACCOUNT FOR ADMISSION OF HAWAII AS A STATE

Two provisions of the Act "to amend certain laws of the United States in light of the

admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union"⁸ are relevant for present purposes. They are, as follows:

Hawaiian Homes Commission lands

SEC. 41. Section 5(b) of the Act of March 18, 1959 (73 Stat. 5) [i.e., the Admission Act], is amended by inserting, immediately following the words "public property" the words "and to all lands defined as 'available lands' by section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended."

Lease by United States of public property of Hawaii

SEC. 42. Until August 21, 1964, there shall be covered into the treasury of the State of Hawaii the rentals or consideration received by the United States with respect to public property taken for the uses and purposes of the United States under section 91 of the Hawaiian Organic Act and thereafter by the United States leased, rented, or granted upon revocable permits to private parties.

1961 OPINION OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

On June 12, 1961, Attorney General Robert Kennedy responded to a request which had originally been made by President Eisenhower for an interpretation of section 5 of the Hawaiian Statehood Act (Public Law 86-3), focusing specifically on which lands then being held by the United States Government were subject to a provision in section 5 that required the Federal Government, within five years after Hawaii's admission as a State, to identify lands no longer needed for any federal purpose and to transfer title to those lands to the State of Hawaii.

Under subsection (a) of section 5 of the Statehood Act, the state government (and its political subdivisions) succeeded to the title of the territorial government (and its subdivisions) in those "lands and other properties" in which the territorial government (and its subdivisions) held title immediately before admission. Under subsection (b) of section 5 of the Statehood Act, the state government was granted title by the United States to "all the public lands and other public property" in which the United States held title immediately before admission. Subsection (c) of section 5 of the Statehood Act created an exception to the two special rules set out under subsections (a) and (b). According to this exception, any "lands and other properties" that, as of the date of admission, had been "set aside" for use by the Federal Government pursuant to an Act of Congress, an Executive order, a proclamation of the President, or a proclamation of the Governor, would remain federal property (subject only to whatever limitations might be specified in the Act, order, or proclamation, as the case might be). Under subsection (d) of section 5 of the Statehood Act, in the case of any "public lands or other public property" title to which was granted by the United States to the State of Hawaii under the rule set out in subsection (b), if those lands or other property were controlled by the United States immediately before admission under a permit, a license, or by permission, of the territorial government, then, at any time within five years after admission, those lands or other property could be "set aside" for use by the United States by an Act of Congress or an Executive order of the President and would thereafter be the property of the United States. Subsection (e) of section 5 of the Admission Act was of crucial significance for purposes of Attorney General Kennedy's opinion. It imposed an obligation requiring every Federal agency controlling any "land or property" retained by the United States under either subsection (c) or

subsection (d) of section 5 to report to the President within five years after admission with respect to their continued need for the land or other property. If the President then decided that no continuing need existed, the land or other property was to be conveyed to the State of Hawaii.

The specific question addressed by the Attorney General was whether property acquired (e.g., through purchase or condemnation) by the United States after the date of annexation (i.e., what the Attorney General described as "afteracquired property") was subject to the reporting and conveyance requirement of section 5(e) of the Statehood Act. The Department of Defense and the General Services Administration held the position that such afteracquired property was not subject to section 5(e) while the Department of the Interior and the State of Hawaii held the position that it was. The Attorney General's opinion stated, in relevant part, that:

The complex provisions of section 5 are indicative of a congressional purpose to convey to the State of Hawaii and its subdivision the ceded property⁹ and territorial property which had not been set aside¹⁰ at the time of admission of Hawaii into the Union, and as much of the territorial and ceded property which had been set aside as would not be required by the United States within five years after admission. The statutory plan thus is for the new State to obtain title to the property acquired by the United States from the Republic of Hawaii and from the Territory to the extent that it had not been taken for the uses and purposes of the United States, and to determine during the following five years the extent to which set aside property no longer would be needed by the United States and therefore could be returned to the State of Hawaii. Underlying this plan is the reservation contained in the Joint Resolution of Annexation (*supra*, n. 3) that the ceded lands not needed by the United States should be used for the benefit of the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands. It seems plain that the afteracquired property of the United States,¹¹ i.e., property not obtained from the Republic of Hawaii or from the Territory, does not find any place in this statutory design.¹²

REVISION OF PROCEDURES FOR CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF HAWAII

An Act for the revision of "procedures established by the Hawaii Statehood Act ... for the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Hawaii"¹³ stated, in relevant part, that:

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) whenever after August 21, 1964, any of the public lands and other public property as defined in section 5(g) of Public Law 86-3 (73 Stat. 4, 6) [i.e., the admission Act], or any lands acquired by the Territory of Hawaii and its subdivisions, which are the property of the United States pursuant to section 5(c) or become the property of the United States pursuant to section 5(d) of Public Law 86-3, except the lands administered pursuant to the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended, and (ii) whenever any of the lands of the United States on Sand Island, including the reef lands in connection therewith, in the city and county of Honolulu, are determined to be surplus property by the Administrator of General Services (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") with the concurrence of the head of the department or agency exercising administration or control over such lands and property, they shall be conveyed to the State of Hawaii by the Administrator subject to the provisions of this Act.

(b) Such lands and property shall be conveyed without monetary consideration, but subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe: *Provided*, That, as a condition precedent to the conveyance of such lands, the Administrator shall require payment by the State of Hawaii of the estimated fair market value, as determined by the Administrator, of any buildings, structures, and other improvements erected and made on such lands after they were set aside. In the event that the State of Hawaii does not agree to any payment prescribed by the Administrator, he may remove, relocate, and otherwise dispose of any such buildings, structures, and other improvements under other applicable laws, or if the Administrator determines that they cannot be removed without substantial damage to them or the lands containing them, he may dispose of them and the lands involved under other applicable laws, but, in such cases he shall pay to the State of Hawaii that portion of any proceeds from such disposal which he estimates to be equal to the value of the lands involved. Nothing in this section shall prevent the disposal by the Administrator under other applicable laws of the lands subject to conveyance to the State of Hawaii under this section if the State of Hawaii so chooses.

SEC. 2. Any lands, property, improvements, and proceeds conveyed or paid to the State of Hawaii under section 1 of this Act shall be considered a part of [sic] public trust established by section 5(f) of Public Law 86-3, and shall be subject to the terms and conditions of that trust.¹⁴

SPECIAL RULE FOR FORT DE RUSSY

A special constraint on the disposition of lands comprising part of Fort De Russy was included in a military construction authorization bill in 1967.¹⁵ This constraint was stated, as follows:

SEC. 809. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the lands constituting Fort De Russy, Hawaii, may be sold, leased, transferred, or otherwise disposed of by the Department of Defense unless hereafter authorized by law.

As the foregoing discussion makes clear, the constraints imposed by federal law on dispositions of federally owned land situated in Hawaii are numerous and complex. A key consideration to be taken into account in assessing which might apply to a particular piece of property is how title to the property was acquired by the United States.

ROBERT B. BURDETTE,
Legislative Attorney.

FOOTNOTES

¹ See Joint Resolution No. 55, 55th Congress, 2d Session, 30 Stat. 750 (July 7, 1898).

² See "An Act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," Chap. 339, 31 Stat. 141 (1900).

³ *Ibid.*, at pages 142 and 154-55.

⁴ See 25 Op. Atty. Gen. 225.

⁵ See 32 Stat. 419, 464-465.

⁶ Chapter 42, 67th Congress, 1st Session (1921), 42 Stat. 108 (July 9, 1921).

⁷ The Hawaiian Statehood Act, Public Law 86-3, 86th Congress, 73 Stat. 4 (March 18, 1969).

⁸ Public Law 86-624, 74 Stat. 411 (July 12, 1960), known as the Hawaii Omnibus Act.

⁹ Earlier in the opinion, the Attorney General had characterized property acquired by the United States under the Resolution of Cession and Annexation (or in exchange therefor) as "ceded property" for purposes of the analysis.

¹⁰ Earlier in the opinion, the Attorney General had noted that, following annexation, the Territory of Hawaii obtained title to property in two ways: some property was conveyed to the territorial government by direction of the President under the terms of the Organic Act and some property was purchased by the territorial government after the date of an-

nexation. The opinion also explained that some property of both types was "set aside" by the territorial Governor under the terms of the Organic Act for the use of the United States. Title to property which was acquired after the date of annexation by the territorial government and which was not subsequently "set aside" for the use of the United States was retained by the Territory as of the date of admission.

¹¹ That is, property acquired by the United States through purchase or condemnation after the date of annexation.

¹² See 42 Op. Atty. Gen. 43, 53.

¹³ Public Law 88-233, 77 Stat. 472 (December 23, 1963).

¹⁴ Emphasis added.

¹⁵ Section 809 of Public Law 90-110, 81 Stat. 279, 309 (October 21, 1967).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). Under the rule, the Committee rises.

□ 1800

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. DURBIN, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2401), to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during Rollcall No. 418, the Schroeder amendment to the Defense Department authorization bill, and did not cast a vote on this amendment. The Schroeder amendment calls on the Base Closure and Realignment Commission to include foreign bases in its recommendations. For the RECORD, I would like to announce that I would have voted "aye" on this amendment.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for several rollcall votes and I would like to submit for the RECORD how I would have voted had I been present:

Rollcall No. 415, Dellums amendment, "no."
Rollcall No. 416, Abercrombie amendment, "no."
Rollcall No. 417, Bryant amendment, "no."
Rollcall No. 418, Schroeder amendment, "no."
Rollcall No. 419, Lloyd amendment, "yes."
Rollcall No. 420, Frank amendment, "no."
Rollcall No. 421, Hansen amendment, "yes."
Rollcall No. 422, Andrews (ME) amendment, "no."
Rollcall No. 423, Walker amendment, "yes."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the actions thus far taken on the bill, H.R. 2401, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE FRANK PALLONE, JR., MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable FRANK PALLONE, Jr. a Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 8, 1993.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that a member of my staff has been served with a subpoena issued by the Municipal Court, Monmouth County, New Jersey.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

FRANK PALLONE, JR.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 9, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to rule L of the rules of the House that a member of my Committee staff has been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel to the Clerk, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is not inconsistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI,
Chairman.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DOORKEEPER OF THE HOUSE

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 8, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House, The Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that a member of my staff has been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

JAMES T. MOLLOY,
Doorkeeper.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2403, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2403) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Lightfoot moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2403 be instructed to insist on the House position on amendment numbered 38, to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment numbered 39, to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment numbered 43 for only that part of the amendment on pages 32 lines 8 through 15, to agree to the Senate amendment numbered 44, and to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment numbered 45.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT].

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, to keep this very brief, in essence our instruction to recommit basically in instructing the conferees to concur with the House's position on the Treasury/Postal bill, and in doing so we feel it is appropriate at this point in time that we continue with the House position, and basically what we are talking about is about \$2.8 million. It is not a huge amount of money, but at the same time we have to step off, I think, in the right direction. We are talking about reinventing Government. One of the things that is foremost is obviously to cut down on spending and overlap of jurisdiction. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to instruct covers several amendments in disagreement. It instructs the managers on the part of the House to insist on the House position regarding the consolidation of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy and the Office of Management and Budget.

The motion would also instruct the managers on the part of the House to insist on the House position which eliminates all funding for both the administrative conference of the United States and the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Finally, the motion instructs the managers on the part of the House to agree to the Senate amendment which rescinds funds for the citizens Commission on Public Service and Compensation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the House conferees should be given the maximum flexibility in conference and, therefore, I oppose the motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The Administrative Conference of the United States [ACUS] has been in existence for nearly 30 years. The view that the important role performed by this agency is somehow no longer needed and no longer relevant is simply a mistaken notion. A decision to eliminate all funding for the Administrative Conference in fiscal year 1994 would, in my view, be "penny-wise and pound-foolish."

The Administrative Conference provides unique, expert advice to the executive branch, the independent regulatory agencies, the Federal courts, and to the Congress. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have frequently relied on the Conference's expertise in drafting and formulating legislation. It is the only entity in the U.S. Government which focuses on administrative law, in all of its many facets. Decisions made as part of the Federal regulatory process—the regulations that are adopted and the cases that are adjudicated—as we all know have a tremendous impact on the substantive direction of important public policy issues. We are talking here about health, education, public safety, the environment, transportation and consumer protection—just to cite a few areas impacted by Federal administrative procedure and regulatory enforcement.

The Administrative Procedure Act was passed by Congress to ensure that due process rights are accorded to individuals and to organizations when Federal regulations are promulgated and when cases are adjudicated. The Administrative Conference provides a forum for the resolution of questions relating to administrative fairness and uniform regulatory enforcement.

Many recommendations made over the years by the Administrative Conference have been enacted into law or

have been implemented under existing statutory authority by the various departments and agencies. For example, ACUS has had a major role in the adoption and/or implementation of such laws as the Equal Access to Justice Act, Superfund, the Contract Disputes Act, the Fair Housing Act, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the Government in the Sunshine Act, the Negotiated Rulemaking Act, and the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act.

It is particularly ironic that advocates for the elimination of the Administrative Conference would cite the savings of taxpayer dollars. As we all know, ACUS is an exceedingly small agency with a modest budget—\$2.3 million in fiscal year 1993. But, even more compelling, is the fact that the pivotal role played by the Administrative Conference actually saves the taxpayers money. For example, in 1990, the Congress assigned ACUS the key role of coordinating and promoting alternative dispute resolution [ADR] mechanisms among over 80 Federal departments and agencies. The installation of ADR systems within the Federal Government has already led to significant cost savings. The Labor Department established a pilot program last year for OSHA and wage and hour cases—those cases are now resolved quicker and cheaper. The Federal Deposit Insurance Commission [FDIC] estimates that it has saved over \$4 million annually based upon the installation of the ADR. Similarly, the Farmers Home Administration has used the ADR on foreclosure cases—not only saving money but actually preventing foreclosures on several farm families.

The role of the Administrative Conference is an ongoing one and it is needed. This Congress very soon will be called upon to deal with the complex issue of Health Care Reform and respond to the challenge presented by the report of the National Performance Review. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Administrative Conference could again play a pivotal role with respect to both of these important matters. This is not the time to ignore the importance of administrative law or to do away with experts in the Federal regulatory process.

□ 1810

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this motion to instruct Treasury appropriations conferees on the matter of funding for the Administrative Conference. The motion would encourage this body to exterminate a small agency that plays an important ongoing role in helping to improve the operations of the Federal Government. It is not a little ironic

that the motion comes during the same week that the administration's national performance review has been unveiled which attempts—on a broader scale—to do across the Government precisely what the Administrative Conference does in streamlining agency procedures.

The Administrative Conference, a \$2.3 million operation, provides advice and assistance on a continuing basis to Federal agencies charged with the implementation of new laws and regulations—to help those agencies improve and simplify their regulatory, enforcement, and adjudicatory functions. The agency also assists Congress by recommending or analyzing legislative changes intended to increase the efficiency and fairness of agency procedures.

In short, the Administrative Conference acts as an ongoing mini-national performance review in its area of expertise, just as the administrative office of the Judicial Conference does in overseeing the operations of the judiciary.

Because of its vital mission, the administration opposes defunding the Administrative Conference. Indeed, the administration supports fiscal year 1994 funding for this agency at a level higher than the Senate's \$1.8 million.

Authorization for the Administrative Conference expires on September 30, 1994. The Judiciary Committee intends next year to thoroughly examine the agency's functions. That is the appropriate time and the proper forum to make determinations on the role and usefulness of the Administrative Conference. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this motion.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], a member of the committee.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion. The motion simply asks the conferees to consistently uphold the position already taken by this House in defunding several small agencies that provide services which duplicate those that are or could be performed elsewhere within the Government.

For example, regarding the Administrative Conference, their oversight function is basically to help other agencies to coordinate. That function dealing with Federal regulations and administrative oversight can be performed within the Department of Justice. It can be performed within the Office of Management and Budget which has subdivisions for an Office of General Management and also an Office for Informational and Regulatory Affairs.

This is a case of duplication of services, Mr. Speaker, and if we are serious about trying to restrict the amount of Federal spending to bring down the Federal Government to size, if on the

one hand we have responded favorably to the Government re-invention initiatives of the Clinton administration and Vice President GORE, then to be consistent we have to vote that way.

When we have Federal agencies that provide duplicative efforts, then we need to do away with those agencies and roll them up into the others that are doing the same job or can do the same job without extra personnel, without extra rent, without extra fringe benefits, without extra personnel policies, without extra budgets.

The dollar amount here is fairly small, Mr. Speaker, in the scope of the national budget. It is \$7 million, but it is important to inform the public whether or not we are serious about downsizing the Federal Government. If we are serious, we should vote the same way that we already voted previously in this House, in favor of this motion to instruct conferees. If we vote any other way, we are backing down. We are sending a message to the taxpayers around the country that we did not mean it when we said that we wanted to save their money and be more economical.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote in favor of the motion.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the ranking member of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just rise to express my concerns about the proposal to eliminate all funding for the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, which is a very important agency at this juncture, particularly as we are about to go in to a major overhaul of Federal procurement policy.

This agency has done a vital role. It has not done things perfectly. It has made mistakes, but I think we perceive it in the Committee on Government Operations as the vehicle which can be used to effect the very reforms which this administration is talking about; so to eliminate all funding for it, which would be tantamount I think to seeing it disappear as an element of expertise within the Office of Management and Budget to deal with these serious procurement reforms that we have to have ongoing, I think causes me some concern.

I have discussed this matter with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], the ranking member of the subcommittee, and with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]. They assure me that they will work with us to discuss this, because I think we are all agreed that we do not want to lose the expertise we have. We want to build on what is there because if we are really serious about procurement reform, this group,

the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, is the place where we can get those kind of reforms.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, with the assurance that I have from my friends that they will discuss this matter with us.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Iowa obviously have in mind reducing government spending. They have no greater ally in that overall movement than this Member; but I say to you with as much power as I can that this particular program breeds that kind of action by this agency that can save taxpayers' money only if it does what its main function is to do, and that is to provide alternative means of dispute allocation so that it can prevent litigation.

I have been personally involved in some of the oversight for this particular agency and have learned firsthand that in stopping certain suits and preventing others, we can save the taxpayers countless dollars. On this premise and on this premise alone, I feel it is justified to conserve this particular program.

Remember, I want to reduce the deficit. I want to reduce spending, but if we are going to throw out an agency who has as one of its tenets to save taxpayers' money by providing other means of dispute regulation, then we ought to be considering preserving this agency, not throwing it out.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of the time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOYER, VISCLOSKEY, DARDEN, OLIVER, BEVILL, SABO, NATCHER, LIGHTFOOT, WOLF, ISTOOK, and MCDADE.

There was no objection.

□ 1820

NATIONAL POW/MIA RECOGNITION DAY

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of

the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 126) designating September 10, 1993, as "National POW/MIA Recognition Day" and authorizing the display of the National League of Families POW/MIA flag, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, but I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered, and, Mr. Speaker, as the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 219, I rise in support of this legislation to designate tomorrow, Friday, September 10, 1993, as "National POW/MIA Recognition Day." As the sponsor of this important resolution, I am proud that my colleagues who have cosponsored this measure have provided the opportunity for our Nation to support our courageous servicemen of the Vietnamese conflict whose fates are still not determined.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the passage of this measure is important. At a time when our Government has been discussing options which would further expand our relations with China and Vietnam, we, as a nation must demonstrate to the families of those who are presumed missing in action that we have not forgotten their loved ones whose fates are uncertain. Designating September 10, 1993, as National POW/MIA Recognition Day does just that.

Because the Government of Vietnam has information on Americans who are presumed to be prisoners of war or missing in action, I continue to oppose the normalization of relations with Vietnam, until all remaining questions have been answered, and our Government has received a full accounting of those who are prisoners of war or missing in action.

I am concerned that information that has recently come to light indicates that North Vietnam may have made available captured United States airmen to China or the former Soviet Union for interrogation or for holding them. Both countries have always denied this. However, newly declassified United States intelligence reports and a 1967 document from the Soviet Embassy in Hanoi, discloses that the Chinese and the Soviets had access to captured United States airmen and to downed United States aircraft. While no returned POW's have reported being held in China, several of the intelligence documents specifically mention camps which were used to detain United States prisoners.

Based upon this new sensitive information, I believe that Vietnam and China must be more forthcoming on this issue—especially before the United

States joins in any business-as-usual relationship.

Of late, there has been a great deal of pressure to put the Vietnam war behind us. Many suggest that by extending the most-favored-nation status to China and by normalizing relations with Vietnam, our Nation would gain economically, and our balance of trade would be improved. I disagree. We must not simply go on with normalization. We must learn from our history, and teach these lessons, so that future generations will not repeat yesterday's mistakes.

Furthermore, I believe that if and when most-favored-nation status is given to China, and once relations are normalized with Vietnam, any leverage that the United States has, with regards to the POW/MIA issue, will disappear.

While we may not all agree on the course that our future relations with China and Vietnam should take, we do all agree that we must not forget those still presumed to be prisoners of war or missing in action. By supporting House Joint Resolution 219, we will appropriately honor those who have given so much for the freedom and liberty that we enjoy today.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 21st year that I have cosponsored this legislation. And, I am hopeful that 1993 will be the last year that such a resolution will be necessary. My hope is that by this time next year, our Government will have obtained a full accounting of those brave Americans whose fates, at this time, are unknown.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing America's heroes, those who are presumed missing in action, by designating September 10, 1993, as National POW/MIA Recognition Day. I invite all Americans to unite in demonstrating that we will not forget nor forsake those whose fates are unknown.

On Friday, September 10, 1993, let us proudly display the National League of Families POW/MIA flag.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules who at one time served as the chairman of our task force on MIA's and POW's.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I really thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for yielding to me, and I want to really commend the gentleman for bringing this resolution to the floor of this House. For the past 15 years I have served on the task force for POW/MIA's on which I had the privilege of serving for a number of years along with the gentleman when he was chairman as well.

I say to the gentleman, "I recall the time that you and I, and Mr. DORNAN, as a matter of fact sitting on the other side there, when we went to a place

called Hanoi in a place called Vietnam, and we sat across the table from these Communists and actually did something I never thought I would do, and I know you and Mr. DORNAN never thought you would do, and that is to literally beg for the return, not only for live POW's, but for the basic remains of our fallen soldiers, and it's always been a policy of this country that we would not forget these men and women who served in the United States armed forces and who gave their lives for their country."

Mr. Speaker, we must account for them. We are still doing it.

Just the other day we celebrated in this country the 40th anniversary of the end of the Korean war. We still have members of the Armed Forces missing from that war, and, as a matter of fact, in just recent months have brought home some of the remains of fallen soldiers from that war that happened over 40 years ago. We must continue our vigilance.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] from the bottom of my heart for all he has done in this effort. We will not forget these men and women who literally are the reason why we are the greatest and freest Nation in the world today, and I commend the gentleman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for his kind supporting remarks and for his diligent efforts over the years in trying to obtain a full accounting.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to our good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], who also has served for a number of years on this issue on both the task force and in many other capacities in trying to find a final solution to the missing.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and say to him, "BENJAMIN, you have brought great honor to this body never forgetting these men."

As my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, this Congress, the last Congress, the 102d Congress, and the next Congress, the 104th, are in a position to remember the 50th anniversary of all the great and climatic events of World War II. Today, September 9, 1993, is the 50th anniversary of our young men forces landing on the Italian mainland. They had gone through a horrible July and August 50 years ago freeing Sicily from German and Italian Fascist rule. Yes, 50 years ago the wiser heads in the Italian Government signed a separate surrender and peace treaty with the Allied Forces. The Salerno landings were opposed viciously by German forces. We had one battalion, the 2d Battalion from the 143d Army, 36th Division, absolutely decimated, and the words jumped at me off the page when I was

reading this this morning: 450—some men missing in action, and some of them turn up in POW camps, some of them were accounted for, but at least in Italy one could walk the battlefields as in Europe later, as in most of the South Pacific, and, except for young men lost at sea, we could find the remains, we could find unmarked graves or graves in registration. People would bend over backwards to identify them.

I say to my colleagues, "When you walk away from a situation, as we did from Vietnam in 1973, and then watch the collapse to communism in 1975, we didn't have control of the battlefield as we did after World War I and after World War II. It was more like North Korea where thousands and thousands of Americans were buried in unmarked graves, and that story is going to go on for the next decade or two, locating and trying to identify the remains of people in North Korea."

But what is particularly agonizing about Vietnam, and the gentleman and I have sat there, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] just mentioned, in Hanoi itself, and we begged that Communist government in Hanoi to come forward on the warehousing of American remains. The gentleman was in the foreign affairs room way back in 1979, 14 years ago, when a Vietnamese citizen, ethnic Chinese background, sat there. Lester Wolf was then chairman of the Asian Pacific affairs, and he passed multiple polygraph lie detector tests. He said that he personally boxed the remains of over 400 American heroes.

□ 1830

It has finally leaked out from the Intelligence community and has been in the press, it is an open secret, the Vietnamese know it, the Clinton people know it now that they have access to top secret documents, some bodies have obviously come out of the ground, the bones dark brown or blackened, where they sat since the day they died in a plane crash. But other bones have not been interred for more than a year before they were taken out of a grave, cleaned-up, and boxed, and those heroes' remains put on a shelf. Four hundred are still warehoused somewhere in the Hanoi area.

Mr. Speaker, until that government, that Communist government in Hanoi, ends this agony for over 400 American families and gives us the rest of our heroes' remains that have been boxed, then I do not see how any American Government, Republican or Democratic, could ever extend full diplomatic relations to Hanoi.

I have just become aware today of yet another National Endowment for the Arts outrage. They gave some \$45,000 to a group in New York called Accountability, that says we have no right to ask for the accounting of our missing in action.

What has that got to do with art or Federal grants? I am going to get to the bottom of that.

I have one final thought. I am looking down at David Hrdlicka's name on my bracelet, shot down May 18, 1965. He was a known POW for 5 years. His son was too young to go to school. He has put in a full Navy career, Dave Hrdlicka, Jr., flying F-18's and is now a senior pilot flying 727's with American Airlines, about to go over to 757's.

Mr. Speaker, to see a whole family suffer this way, and all the kids grow up, and his brother Leo has still not given up, and you have met with Leo in your office, I am going to I guess wear Dave Hrdlicka's bracelet for the rest of my life until I get some sort of accounting out of North Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt we left live men behind in Laos. The number one prisoner still carried on the books, our one POW from Vietnam, Col. Charles Shelton, April 29, 1965, went down 2 weeks before Dave, they were in a cave together. There are at least two verified intelligence stories that Charlie Shelton escaped, was shot both times, and recovered from his wounds. His wonderful wife Marian, after 25 years of fighting for recognition of his plight, the one American POW, rising in rank to colonel, he was a captain when he was shot down, Marian took her own life October 4, 3 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the agony just goes on and on. We cannot recognize that Government until they resolve the mysteries of Laos and answer all the mysterious questions on Vietnam. But more than anything else, which is a hard fact, give us the remains of our heroes out of those warehouses, and then maybe we can heal finally some of the remaining wounds of that war. In addition, they must stop the human rights abuses.

Mr. Speaker, I once again thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and look forward to standing at his side on his recognition day, so that we never ever forget the terrible way that we ended this conflict, leaving all these American families to wonder about the fate of their great heroes who died fighting for freedom, and some of them rotting in a prison cell, and they still might be there. Only God knows.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] for his eloquent remarks and for his continued strong support on this issue. I also thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and all of my colleagues who join together, over 225 Members, in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 126

Whereas the United States has fought in many wars and thousands of Americans who served in those wars were captured by the enemy or listed as missing in action;

Whereas many American prisoners of war were subjected to brutal and inhumane treatment by their enemy captors in violation of international codes and customs for the treatment of prisoners of war, and many such prisoners of war died from such treatment;

Whereas many of these Americans are still listed as missing and unaccounted for, and the uncertainty surrounding their fates has caused their families to suffer tragic and continuing hardships;

Whereas, in Public Law 101-355, the Federal Government officially recognized and designated the National League of Families POW/MIA flag as the symbol of the Nation's concern and commitment to accounting as fully as possible for Americans still prisoner, missing in action, or unaccounted for in Southeast Asia; and

Whereas the sacrifices of Americans still missing and unaccounted for from all our Nation's wars and their families are deserving of national recognition and support for continued priority efforts to determine the fate of those missing Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL POW/MIA RECOGNITION DAY.

September 10, 1993, is designated as "National POW/MIA Recognition Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT TO DISPLAY NATIONAL LEAGUE OF FAMILIES POW/MIA FLAG.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The POW/MIA flag shall be displayed—

(1) at all national cemeteries and the National Vietnam Veterans Memorial on May 31, 1993 (Memorial Day), September 10, 1993 (National POW/MIA Recognition Day), and November 11, 1993 (Veterans Day); and

(2) on, or on the grounds of, the buildings specified in subsection (b) on September 10, 1993;

as the symbol of our Nation's concern and commitment to accounting as fully as possible for Americans still prisoner, missing, and unaccounted for, thus ending the uncertainty for their families and the Nation.

(b) BUILDINGS.—The buildings specified in this subsection are—

- (1) the White House; and
- (2) the buildings containing the primary offices of—
 - (A) the Secretary of State;
 - (B) the Secretary of Defense;
 - (C) the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; and
 - (D) the Director of the Selective Service System.

(c) POW/MIA FLAG.—As used in this section, the term "POW/MIA flag" means the National League of Families POW/MIA flag recognized officially and designated by section 2 of Public Law 101-355.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on Senate Joint Resolution 126.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of ascertaining the schedule from the majority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, obviously business is finished for today. On Monday, September 13, the House will meet at noon to take up 16 bills on suspension. Recorded votes will be held until after the suspensions are finished; in other words, at the end of the day. We will have a rule vote at around 4 p.m. on an additional amount of amendments on the defense bill. We should be done on that day by 7 or 8 o'clock.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. to take up again H.R. 2401, the Defense authorization for fiscal year 1994, and we will try to complete consideration. I do not know whether we will or not.

We also have scheduled H.R. 1340, the Resolution Trust Corporation Completion Act, subject to a rule. I am not certain at this point whether or not we will have time to bring that bill up, but it is scheduled.

On Wednesday, September 15, the House will meet at 2 p.m., but there will be no legislative business. We will have a pro forma session.

When the House adjourns on Wednesday, September 15, it will adjourn to meet on Monday, September 20, 1993. Conference reports will be brought up at any time. Any further program will be announced later.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I have just a couple of questions. If I understand correctly, the first vote we can expect on Monday will occur at 4 o'clock when we vote on the rule?

Mr. GEPHARDT. The first vote would be on the rule at about 4 p.m. Obviously, there could be additional votes after that on suspensions.

Mr. WALKER. Do we intend to move to the defense bill at all on Monday?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Yes.

Mr. WALKER. And then go on the defense bill until 7 or 8 o'clock that night?

Mr. GEPHARDT. That is correct.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if I look correctly at the amendments that have been made in order by the third rule on defense, there are 54 amendments, all allocated 10 minutes of time, which would mean we would have 9 hours of debate on those amendments alone, not including any time for votes. That seems to be a pretty large order for us to complete next week, unless we go very, very late on Tuesday night. Is that the intention of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it is my understanding that the chairman of the committee has the authority to bring some amendments in an en bloc fashion, which might be able to shorten the time that it takes to finish the bill. I do not think we will go extraordinarily late on Tuesday. If we can finish it, we obviously want to. If we cannot, we will not.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the gentleman correctly, it is anticipated we will probably not get to the Resolution Trust Corporation next week.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I think the chance of that is not high.

Mr. WALKER. Also it is my understanding that conference reports are probably ready on the District of Columbia bill and possibly on Commerce, State, and Justice. Is there any chance that we would get to those next week?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think the chance of that is not at all likely. It is my understanding that the District of Columbia bill did not even go to conference, did not meet as a conference. So I think the chance of that is not high.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1993

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1993

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, September 13, 1993, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, September 14, 1993.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1993

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns on Tuesday, September 14, 1993, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Wednesday, September 15, 1993.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

□ 1840

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI], on Wednesday, September 15, 1993, be transposed with a special order for the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. HILLIARD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S HEALTH PLAN

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Time magazine reported last week that the Clinton administration health plan will cost the loss of as many 1 million jobs over the next 5 years. This report was based not on a charge by some group opposed to the President. According to Time, this estimate of a million job loss came from a computer projection by the President's own staff.

The National Federation of Independent Businesses has estimated a job loss of 1.6 million, if the President goes forward with his health plan. A study by the National Restaurant Association estimates job losses as high as 3.1 million over 5 years due to the proposed health reform.

Everyone knows we need some changes in our health care system, but it is the Federal bureaucracy, rules and redtape that has been the primary cause of rising health care costs.

If we really want health care costs to go down, we need more freedom in the system, not more government. It is easy to say 1 million jobs lost. But to the person who loses his or her job, there is nothing easy about it. We sim-

ply cannot afford, Mr. Speaker, a health care plan that causes us to lose 1 million more jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following article:

[From Time magazine, Sept. 6, 1993]

PROGNOSIS: FEWER JOBS

(By Dick Thompson)

While Bill Clinton relaxed on Martha's Vineyard last week, staff members were sweating and fretting back in Washington, studying computer models for answers to one of the most explosive questions facing his health-care-reform proposal. That question—the subject of a showdown meeting scheduled with the President this week—is, How many jobs will be lost during the long transition to reform?

Clinton has publicly stated that healthcare reform will "boost job creation," a claim that unnerves many of his advisers. What they know—and what some of them fear Clinton has not been told—is that the Administration's own preliminary computer-aided studies of the "employment effects" of health reform predict "significant" job losses.

Time has learned that according to one computer run, the plan would slow net employment growth by as many as 1 million jobs over the next five years. Other Administration forecasts—based on computer simulations of the U.S. economy at various government departments and the Urban Institute, a Washington think tank on contract to the White House—have produced lower estimates of job losses, sources said. But they do not support Clinton's claims of job gains.

Sources caution that these forecasts resulted from a draft of the health-reform plan that is still being refined, and was tested on an econometric model that included "faulty assumptions" about the ways in which employers, workers and health-care providers are likely to respond to healthcare reform. Still, these estimates—and others by independent economists who predict job losses in the 200,000-to-600,000 range—galvanized Clinton's health-reform advisers last week into a crash program to refine both their computer models and the health-care plan in order to minimize their forecast of unemployment. Says a worried official: "The jobs issue is probably the most sensitive one we face in health-care reform."

Privately, several of the President's advisers contend that the current runaway spending on public and private health care is a growing burden on the economy, which, like a surgical patient who must feel worse before he can get better, might need to endure modestly higher unemployment for several years as the price of reform. Trouble is, Clinton has not prepared the public for any sacrifice. He and his top health-care strategist, Ira Magaziner, have been selling health-care reform as a four-course free lunch. Everyone will be covered. It won't require new taxes. It will immediately boost job creation. And it will immediately reduce the federal deficit. "Several of us," says a political adviser to Clinton, "are worried that we're creating expectations for health care that can't be met."

No business will be required to pay more than 7.6% of its total payroll for health insurance. For big companies, such as automakers, which now pay about 19%, the potential savings would provide an incentive to hire new workers. But for small firms that now provide no health insurance, the requirement will add to the cost of labor. Some of these firms will cover the cost by cutting

profits, raising prices, withholding raises or extending overtime hours. But many firms will not have these options. Most vulnerable are enterprises like restaurants and farms, which employ many of the nation's 4.8 million minimum-wage workers and often operate with slim profit margins. For them, cutting jobs may be the only option. The National Federation of Independent Business has estimated that 1.6 million jobs will be lost over five years. A new study, financed by restaurant owners, forecasts losses of 3.1 million.

The White House rejects these figures as flawed because they don't sufficiently account for jobs created in firms that save money through lower insurance costs and because they are based on false assumptions about the tightly guarded reform plan. The next computer runs, to be conducted on the Urban Institute's microsimulator (called TRIM, for Transfer Income Simulator), will include various "transition subsidies" designed to minimize job losses for small businesses and low-income employees. His advisers plan to present Clinton with four options this week for easing the transition, but one official said they were having trouble designing subsidies that were not "a nightmare to administer."

Hillary Clinton, who heads the health-care-reform effort, is committed to a rapid phase-in, by January 1996, for universal coverage and a generous basic-benefits package—through few others believe this schedule is realistic. She has waved off warnings of job losses as the propaganda of greedy business interests. Her strong views and assiduous hunting of suspected leakers have exerted what one official describes as a "chilling effect" in sessions she attends. Nevertheless, at a recent meeting, her colleagues report that Laura Tyson, chair of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, cautioned that once the plan is released, respected outside economists will run it through standard econometric models, which will probably show job losses, "and some of those numbers might be big."

Clinton health-care planners have tried to address the concerns raised by small business, which enjoys great influence in Congress. They emphasize that under the proposal, the smallest businesses will pay as little as 3.5% of their payroll for insurance, rather than the 7.6% top rate, with taxpayers subsidizing the rest. And the smallest businesses will be allowed a slower phase-in of the new expense. Insists Magaziner: "We think we can do this without having a negative employment effect." Magaziner, backed by Hillary Clinton, has so far insulated the President from international assessments that might challenge his rosy scenario. But that, officials say, will change in the meeting scheduled this week.

Many small-business owners who want to provide health coverage for their workers will back reform because the current situation inflicts large and growing hundreds on them. Audrey Rinker, owner of a graphics shop in New Port Richey, Florida, has been denied coverage by three insurance companies because her workers have pre-existing illnesses. Says Rinker: "We need something done right now." Even when they can get insurance, small companies pay some of the highest rates. Barbara Silver Miller, co-owner of a vending machine firm in Phoenix, Arizona, has seen premiums for her employees rise 20% to 30% a year.

To reform this festering mess, some Clinton officials argue privately, the transitional loss of a few hundred thousand jobs is not a

high price to pay. Certainly not in an economy that employs 120 million workers and creates 2 million jobs a year. Yet for the individuals involved, a single job lost on a Nebraska farm isn't really "a net wash" when a new job—requiring relocation and training—is created in a Detroit auto plant.

BILLS TO COMBAT VIOLENCE AND DRUG-RELATED CRIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today a package of four bills designed to combat violence and drug-related crimes in our streets and neighborhoods.

These bills are the Drive-By Shooting Prevention Act of 1993; the Juveniles in Crime Prevention Act of 1993; the Three-Time Loser Act of 1993; and the Law Enforcement Officers Death Penalty Act of 1993.

This legislation will provide Federal law enforcement with powerful new weapons in their war against illegal drugs and crime involving juvenile and repeat offenders.

Mr. Speaker, these bills are practically identical to those I introduced in the last Congress. Provisions of all four of these bills were incorporated in the Violent Crime Control Act passed by the Senate 2 years ago. Because of their importance to law enforcement, it is essential that these proposals also be included in the omnibus anticrime legislation that will be considered in the Congress this year.

My first bill would add to the Federal Criminal Code a provision aimed at curbing the indiscriminate use of weapons by youthful gangs involved in drive-by shootings in the furtherance of illegal drug conspiracies. The Drive-By Shooting Prevention Act of 1993 would make it a Federal crime for someone who, in the course of committing a major drug offense, intentionally fires a weapon into a group of persons gathered nearby, killing or endangering the life of an innocent bystander. The bill provides the death penalty or imprisonment for any term of years up to and including life for anyone convicted of murdering a drive-by shooting victim.

A constituent of mine, Carolyn Jamelkowski of Camarillo, wrote a letter to the editor of the Ventura Star Free Press about the war on drugs and the criminal gangs that rage in the streets of our cities. She also wrote to me and to then-President Bush earnestly seeking our assistance in stopping the increasingly frequent drive-by shooting incidents in her neighborhood and elsewhere. In her letter she asked why we must send our brave young men and women to fight in overseas battle-grounds when we cannot protect ourselves and our families from violence by drug criminals and street gangs in the streets of our communities right here in the United States. She bemoans the fact that some of our boys have returned home from war only to be shot and killed in their own country. She writes with passion and understanding, for Mrs. Jamelkowski's own son, a veteran, was the tragic, innocent victim of a drive-by shooting as he walked home from work one night.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting the complete text of Mrs. Jamelkowski's letter for the RECORD.

Too many of us have known persons whose sons or daughters or other beloved ones have become the innocent victims of some drive-by shooting by a gang member high on drugs or seeking retribution against some other young pusher or rival gang member. I hope that my proposal will be adopted and included in the omnibus crime package so that we can soon bring an end to such senseless street crimes and to the tragic killings brought on by drug-related violence.

My second bill would mandate longer prison sentences for those criminals who sell illegal substances to minor youths or who use minors in their drug-trafficking activities. Under the Juveniles in Drug Crime Prevention Act of 1993, any adult who is convicted of selling drugs to juveniles or of utilizing a juvenile to peddle drugs to other youngsters will serve a mandatory minimum sentence of 10 years in prison, without parole.

This legislation will serve as a stiff warning to drug dealers that if they sell drugs to kids or employ kids in their illegal activities, they can expect to serve a long prison sentence, without any hope of getting off or of receiving probation or a suspended sentence. Moreover, if they come out of prison and are then caught committing additional drug crimes involving juveniles they will be locked up for life. Such a measure should help to safeguard many otherwise innocent children from the entrapment of using drugs or from inducements offered by adult traffickers to engage in the peddling of drugs.

My third bill, the Three-Time Loser Act of 1993, would mandate life imprisonment without parole for twice-convicted violent criminals or drug traffickers who are convicted of a third offense. Unfortunately the 3- and 4-time and even 10-time loser is too often released early or on bond and allowed to walk the streets of our cities, free to commit additional crimes. There is too much violent and drug-related crime in this country, in part, because there is too much crime without real punishment and there are too many felons who are allowed to go unpunished in America. Hardened, repeat criminals know they can expect to be set loose all too soon after being sentenced, perhaps to relieve jail overcrowding, and too many Americans are becoming the innocent prey to these recidivists.

According to one study by Dr. Morgan Reynolds of the National Center for Policy Analysis in Texas, of criminal arrests, indictments, convictions, sentencing and sentences actually served, based on data of crimes over a period of almost 40 years in the United States, a person who commits murder can expect to serve on the average only 2.3 years in prison; someone who commits burglary can expect to serve just 17.7 days; and for car theft the criminal can expect just 4.2 days behind bars. Some have argued that these figures are skewed because Dr. Reynolds includes in his figures those murderers, burglars, and thieves who don't get caught. I believe these figures are relevant because they certainly give comfort to prospective criminals. However, even if we look at only those apprehended and convicted, the statistics are still

an outrage. The Justice Department reports that the convicted murderer can expect to serve a mean term of 83 months, the burglar 22 months, and the car thief 13 months. It's not very comforting to know that a murderer serves less than 7 years in prison on the average!

With such statistics showing how little time murderers and felons actually serve behind bars and how little chance they have of ever being arrested or convicted, it is little wonder that criminals repeat their crimes, realizing that can do so without severe or lengthy penalties—with little more than a slap on the wrist!

My bill will serve notice on repeat felons that they can expect to serve a mandatory life term in prison without parole if they are convicted of any combination of a violent crime or a drug felony as little as three times. If enacted, the proposal should result in a dramatically reduced rate of criminal recidivism. I also suspect we would hear less often of criminals who are let out of jail after a short sentence only to commit another drug-related or violent crime within a short time.

Finally, the Law Enforcement Officers' Death Penalty Act of 1993 would authorize the penalty of death for the murder of a Federal law enforcement officer while the officer is carrying out his official duties and for the murder of a State or local law enforcement officer while that officer is in the course of duty assisting a Federal law enforcement officer. The bill also sets forth the procedures and factors to be considered in imposing the sentence of death on a criminal defendant.

In my view, there are few crimes more despicable than the murder of a police officer while in the line of duty. These are the guardians of our lives and our security who protect us, our families, and our neighborhoods from criminals. Every day thousands of these brave and honorable men and women risk their lives so that we can be free to enjoy our rights, our privacy, our property, and our pursuit of happiness. The life of a cop or a Federal agent is in constant danger. In this era when illegal drugs, street violence, and swelling crime rates are everyday events, we must show well-deserved respect, honor, and gratitude to the squads of crimefighters we employ to protect us at the Federal, State, and local level. We must also demonstrate to the drug dealers, murderers, and other serious criminals that we will not tolerate, under any circumstances, the murder of these peace officers and that those who kill them intentionally or in the course of committing some other crime will pay for our loss with their own lives.

In 1990 there were 664 Federal law enforcement officers murdered in the line of duty; in 1991 there were 683. There are no figures available on the exact number of State and local public safety officers who were also killed while assisting Federal officers in crime-busting activities. My last bill is a kind of personal tribute to the cop on the beat and the Federal officer on duty. It also is a warning to the adult criminal that, regardless of whether his victim is a Federal law enforcement officer or a State law enforcement officer who has come to the assistance of the Federal officer, if he murders that officer while he is carrying out his law enforcement duties, he can expect to be sentenced to certain death. Perhaps the criminal,

fearing capital punishment, will think twice before committing a violent crime that could result in the killing of police officers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and I call on the leadership of both parties in this chamber to include this package of bills, or similar related measures, when the House takes up the omnibus anticrime bill later this fall.

[From the Ventura Star Free Press]

WAR STILL RAGES—ON AMERICAN STREETS

TO THE EDITOR: I am writing President Bush to ask for his help in the fight against gang drive-by shootings.

We have a war going on in this country that keeps getting bigger by the day. People are being killed by these gangs whenever they see fit to go out shooting. Innocent children, women and our sons are victims, even though they haven't hurt gang members or even know them—it doesn't matter to gangs.

Many of the gangs have a requirement that to belong your first have to go out and kill someone—anyone, it doesn't matter. You might be asking how I know. Well, I am a mother whose son was killed in a drive-by shooting as he walked home from work one night three months ago.

I know I am only one voice, but I've decided to ask President Bush, our Senators, Members of Congress and newspapers across our Nation to petition the people of the United States to help put a stop to this war in our streets.

We sent our boys to the Gulf and they did a wonderful job, but some of those boys have come home only to be shot and killed in their own country. We ask, "What are we doing to protect our own people?"

This war has to stop. We are not safe in our own streets. How can we as a Nation tell other countries we are against aggression when in our own country we don't have the laws that will deter crime?

That is why I am asking our leaders to lead us once again into battle against invaders who are killing our people. Please, pass tough laws, such as providing for an automatic death penalty for someone convicted of a drive-by shooting.

Only then—maybe—will our streets be safe once more and the mothers across this nation can stop crying as they sit by the grave of a loved one lamenting, "I know not why".

CAROLYN JAMELKOWSKI

H.R. 3034

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Drive-By Shooting Prevention Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. NEW OFFENSE FOR THE INDISCRIMINATE USE OF WEAPONS TO FURTHER DRUG CONSPIRACIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 2 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 36. Drive-by-shooting

"(a) OFFENSE AND PENALTIES.—

"(1) Whoever—

"(1) in furtherance or to escape detection of a major drug offense listed in subsection (b);

"(2) whether or not in furtherance of criminal gang activities; and

"(3) with the intent to intimidate, harass, injure, or maim;

fires a weapon into a group of two or more persons and thereby causes grave risk to any

human life shall be punished by a term of no more than 25 years, or by fine as provided under this title, or both.

"(2) Whoever, in furtherance or to escape detection of a major drug offense listed in subsection (b) and, with the intent to intimidate, harass, injure, or maim, fires a weapon into a group of two or more persons and who, in the course of such conduct, kills any person shall, if the killing—

"(A) is a first degree murder as defined in section 1111(a) of this title, be punished by death or imprisonment for any term of years or for life, fined under this title, or both; or

"(B) is a murder other than a first degree murder as defined in section 1111(a) of this title, be fined under this title, imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both.

"(b) MAJOR DRUG OFFENSE DEFINED.—A major drug offense within the meaning of subsection (a) is one of the following:

"(1) a continuing criminal enterprise, punishable under section 403(c) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 848(c));

"(2) a conspiracy to distribute controlled substances punishable under section 406 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 846) or punishable under section 1013 of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Control Act (21 U.S.C. 963); or

"(3) an offense involving major quantities of drugs and punishable under section 401(b)(1)(A) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841(b)(1)(A)) or section 1010(b)(1) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960(b)(1)).

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 2 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"36. Drive-by shooting."

H.R. 3035

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Juveniles in Drug Crime Prevention Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. LONGER PRISON SENTENCES FOR THOSE WHO SELL ILLEGAL DRUGS TO MINORS OR FOR USE OF MINORS IN DRUG TRAFFICKING ACTIVITIES.

(a) DISTRIBUTION TO PERSONS UNDER AGE 21.—Section 418 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 859) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by inserting after the second sentence "Except to the extent a greater minimum sentence is otherwise provided by section 401(b), a term of imprisonment under this subsection in a case involving distribution to a person under eighteen years of age shall be not less than 10 years without release. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the court shall not place on probation or suspend the sentence of any person sentenced under the preceding sentence and such person shall not be released during the term of such sentence."; and

(2) in subsection (b) by inserting after the second sentence "Except to the extent a greater minimum sentence is otherwise provided by section 401(b), a term of imprisonment under this subsection in a case involving distribution to a person under eighteen years of age shall be a mandatory term of life imprisonment without release. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the court shall not place on probation or suspend the sentence of any person sentenced under the preceding sentence and such person shall not be released during the term of such sentence.".

(b) EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONS UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE.—Section 420 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 861) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by striking "Except to the extent a greater minimum sentence is otherwise provided, a term of imprisonment under this subsection shall be not less than one year." and inserting "Except to the extent a greater minimum sentence is otherwise provided by section 401(b), a term of imprisonment under this subsection shall be not less than 10 years without release. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the court shall not place on probation or suspend the sentence of any person sentenced under the preceding sentence and such person shall not be released during the term of such sentence."; and

(2) in subsection (c) by striking "Except to the extent a greater minimum sentence is otherwise provided, a term of imprisonment under this subsection shall be not less than one year." and inserting "Except to the extent a greater minimum sentence is otherwise provided by section 401(b), a term of imprisonment under this subsection shall be a mandatory term of life imprisonment without release. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the court shall not place on probation or suspend the sentence of any person sentenced under the preceding sentence and such person shall not be released during the term of such sentence.".

H.R. 3036

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Three-Time Loser Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT RELEASE FOR CRIMINALS CONVICTED A THIRD TIME.

Section 401(b) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841(b)) is amended by striking "If any person commits a violation of this subparagraph or of section 418, 419, or 420 after two or more prior convictions for a felony drug offense have become final, such person shall be sentenced to a mandatory term of life imprisonment without release and fined in accordance with the preceding sentence. For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'and' and inserting "If any person commits a violation of this subparagraph or of section 418, 419, or 420 or a crime of violence after two or more prior convictions for a felony drug offense or crime of violence or for any combination thereof have become final, such person shall be sentenced to not less than a mandatory term of life imprisonment without release and fined in accordance with the preceding sentence. For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'crime of violence' means an offense that is a felony and has as an element the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against the person or property of another, or by its nature involves a substantial risk that physical force against the person or property of another may be used in the course of committing the offense, and the term".

H.R. 3037

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Law Enforcement Officers Death Penalty Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF DEATH PENALTY FOR KILLING FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

Section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting after "except that any such person" the following: "who is found guilty of first degree murder shall also be subject to the penalty of death in accordance with chapter 228 of this title and any such person"; and

(2) by adding at the end "Whoever kills a State or local law enforcement officer, while such officer is in the course of duty assisting a Federal law enforcement officer whose killing is a violation of this section, shall be subject to the same punishment as is provided under this section for the killing of such Federal law enforcement officer in the same circumstances."

SEC. 3. DEATH PENALTY PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after chapter 227 the following:

"CHAPTER 228—DEATH PENALTY PROCEDURES "Sec.

"3591. Sentence of death.

"3592. Factors to be considered in determining whether a sentence of death is justified.

"3593. Special hearing to determine whether a sentence of death is justified.

"3594. Imposition of a sentence of death.

"3595. Review of a sentence of death.

"3596. Implementation of a sentence of death.

"3597. Use of State facilities.

"§ 3591. Sentence of death

"A defendant who commits an offense under section 1114 of this title for which the death penalty may be imposed shall be sentenced to death if, after consideration of the factors set forth in section 3592 of this title in the course of a hearing held pursuant to section 3593 of this title, it is determined that imposition of a sentence of death is justified. However, no person may be sentenced to death who was less than 18 years of age at the time of the offense.

"§ 3592. Factors to be considered in determining whether a sentence of death is justified

"(a) MITIGATING FACTORS.—In determining whether a sentence of death is justified for any offense, the jury, or if there is no jury, the court, shall consider each of the following mitigating factors and determine which, if any, exist:

"(1) MENTAL CAPACITY.—The defendant's mental capacity was significantly impaired, although the impairment was not such as to constitute a defense to prosecution.

"(2) DURESS.—The defendant was under unusual and substantial duress, although not such duress as would constitute a defense to prosecution.

"(3) PARTICIPATION IN OFFENSE MINOR.—The defendant was an accomplice whose participation in the offense was relatively minor.

The jury, or if there is no jury, the court, shall consider whether any other mitigating factor exists.

"(b) AGGRAVATING FACTORS.—In determining whether a sentence of death is justified the jury, or if there is no jury, the court, shall consider each of the following aggravating factors and determine which, if any, exist:

"(1) PREVIOUS CONVICTION OF OFFENSE FOR WHICH A SENTENCE OF DEATH OR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WAS AUTHORIZED.—The defendant has previously been convicted of another Federal or State offense resulting in the death of a person, for which a sentence of life imprisonment or death was authorized by statute.

"(2) PREVIOUS CONVICTION OF OTHER SERIOUS OFFENSES.—The defendant has previously been convicted of two or more Federal or

State offenses, each punishable by a term of imprisonment of more than one year, committed on different occasions, involving controlled substances or the infliction of, or attempted infliction of, serious bodily injury or death upon another person.

"(3) GRAVE RISK OF DEATH TO ADDITIONAL PERSONS.—The defendant, in the commission of the offense, knowingly created a grave risk of death to one or more persons in addition to the victim of the offense.

"(4) HEINOUS, CRUEL, OR DEPRAVED MANNER OF COMMISSION.—The defendant committed the offense in an especially heinous, cruel, or depraved manner.

"(5) PROCUREMENT OF THE OFFENSE BY PAYMENT.—The defendant procured the commission of the offense by payment, or promise of payment, of anything of pecuniary value.

"(6) COMMISSION OF THE OFFENSE FOR PAYMENT.—The defendant committed the offense as consideration for the receipt, or in the expectation of the receipt, of anything of pecuniary value.

"(7) SUBSTANTIAL PLANNING AND PREMEDITATION.—The defendant committed the offense after substantial planning and premeditation.

"(8) VULNERABILITY OF VICTIM.—The victim was particularly vulnerable due to old age, youth, or infirmity.

The jury, or if there is no jury, the court, may consider whether any other aggravating factor exists.

"§ 3593. Special hearing to determine whether a sentence of death is justified

"(a) NOTICE BY THE GOVERNMENT.—If, in a case involving an offense described in section 3591 of this title, the attorney for the Government believes that the circumstances of the offense are such that a sentence of death is justified under this chapter, such attorney shall, a reasonable time before the trial, or before acceptance by the court of a plea of guilty, or at such time thereafter as the court may permit upon a showing of good cause, sign and file with the court, and serve on the defendant, a notice—

"(1) stating that the Government believes that the circumstances of the offense are such that, if the defendant is convicted, a sentence of death is justified under this chapter; and

"(2) setting forth the aggravating factor or factors, including a factor or factors not specifically enumerated in section 3592, that the Government, if the defendant is convicted, proposes to prove as justifying a sentence of death.

The court may permit the attorney for the Government to amend the notice upon a showing of good cause.

"(b) HEARING BEFORE A COURT OR JURY.—If the attorney for the Government has filed a notice as required under subsection (a) of this section and the defendant is found guilty of an offense described in section 3591 of this title, the judge who presided at the trial or before whom the guilty plea was entered, or another judge if that judge is unavailable, shall conduct a separate sentencing hearing to determine the punishment to be imposed. Before such a hearing, no presentence report shall be prepared by the United States Probation Service, notwithstanding the provisions of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. The hearing shall be conducted—

"(1) before the jury that determined the defendant's guilt;

"(2) before a jury impaneled for the purpose of the hearing if—

"(A) the defendant was convicted upon a plea of guilty;

"(B) the defendant was convicted after a trial before the court sitting without a jury;

"(C) the jury that determined the defendant's guilt was discharged for good cause; or

"(D) after initial imposition of a sentence under this section, reconsideration of the sentence under the section is necessary; or

"(3) before the court alone, upon motion of the defendant and with the approval of the attorney for the Government.

A jury impaneled pursuant to paragraph (2) shall consist of 12 members, unless, at any time before the conclusion of the hearing, the parties stipulate, with the approval of the court, that it shall consist of a lesser number.

"(c) PROOF OF MITIGATING AND AGGRAVATING FACTORS.—At the hearing, information may be presented as to any matter relevant to the sentence, including any mitigating or aggravating factor permitted or required to be considered under section 3592 of this title. Information presented may include the trial transcript and exhibits if the hearing is held before a jury or judge not present during the trial. Any other information relevant to a mitigating or aggravating factor may be presented by either the attorney for the Government or the defendant, regardless of its admissibility under the rules governing admission of evidence at criminal trials, except that information may be excluded if its probative value is outweighed by the danger of creating unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, or misleading the jury. The attorney for the Government and for the defendant shall be permitted to rebut any information received at the hearing, and shall be given fair opportunity to present argument as to the adequacy of the information to establish the existence of any aggravating or mitigating factor, and as to the appropriateness of imposing a sentence of death in the case. The attorney for the Government shall open the argument. The defendant shall be permitted to reply. The attorney for the Government shall then be permitted to reply in rebuttal. The burden of establishing the existence of an aggravating factor is on the Government, and is not satisfied unless the existence of such a factor is established beyond a reasonable doubt. The burden of establishing the existence of any mitigating factor is on the defendant, and is not satisfied unless the existence of such a factor is established by a preponderance of the information.

"(d) RETURN OF SPECIAL FINDINGS.—The jury, or if there is no jury, the court, shall consider all the information received during the hearing. It shall return special findings with respect to the mitigating and aggravating factors concerning which information is received at the hearing, stating—

"(1) whether some mitigating factor required to be considered under section 3592 exists;

"(2) whether some aggravating factor required to be considered under section 3592 exists; and

"(3) which specific mitigating or aggravating factor or factors exist.

A finding under paragraph (1) or (2) that some mitigating or aggravating factor exists must be unanimous. A finding under paragraph (3) that a specific mitigating or aggravating factor exists may be made by a majority of at least nine members of the jury.

"(e) RETURN OF A FINDING CONCERNING A SENTENCE OF DEATH.—If, in the case of an offense described in section 3591, an aggravating factor required to be considered under section 3592 is found to exist, the jury, or if there is no jury, the court, shall then consider whether the aggravating factor or factors found to exist sufficiently outweigh all

the mitigating factors found to exist to justify a sentence of death, or, in the absence of a mitigating factor, whether the aggravating factor or factors alone are sufficient to justify a sentence of death. Based upon this consideration, the jury by unanimous vote, or if there is no jury, the court, shall return a finding as to whether a sentence of death is justified. The jury or the court, regardless of its findings with respect to aggravating and mitigating factors, is never required to impose a death sentence and the jury shall be so instructed.

"(f) SPECIAL PRECAUTION TO ASSURE AGAINST DISCRIMINATION.—In a hearing held before a jury, the court, before the return of a finding under subsection (e) of this section, shall instruct the jury that, in considering whether a sentence of death is justified, it shall not consider the race, color, national origin, creed, or sex of the defendant or of any victim. The jury, upon return of a finding under subsection (e) of this section, shall also return to the court a certificate, signed by each juror, that consideration of the race, color, national origin, creed, or sex of the defendant or any victim was not involved in reaching the juror's individual decision.

"§ 3594. Imposition of a sentence of death

"Upon a finding under section 3593(e) of this title that a sentence of death is justified, the court shall sentence the defendant to death. Upon finding under section 3593(e) of this title that no aggravating factor required to be found exists or that a sentence of death is not justified, the court shall impose any sentence other than death that is authorized by law.

"§ 3595. Review of a sentence of death

"(a) APPEAL.—In a case in which a sentence of death is imposed, the sentence shall be subject to review by the court of appeals upon appeal by the defendant. Notice of appeal must be filed within the time specified for the filing of a notice of appeal. An appeal under this section may be consolidated with an appeal of the judgment of conviction and shall have priority over all other cases.

"(b) REVIEW.—The court of appeals shall review the entire record in the case, including—

"(1) the evidence submitted during the trial;

"(2) the information submitted during the sentencing hearing;

"(3) the procedure employed in the sentencing hearing; and

"(4) the special findings returned under section 3593(d) of this title.

"(c) DECISION AND DISPOSITION.—

"(1) If the court of appeals determines that—

"(A) the sentence of death was not imposed under the influence of passion, prejudice, or any other arbitrary factor; and

"(B) the information supports the special findings of the existence of an aggravating factor or factors; it shall affirm the sentence.

"(2) In any other case, the court of appeals shall remand the case for reconsideration under section 3593 or for imposition of another authorized sentence as appropriate.

"(3) The court of appeals shall state in writing the reasons for its disposition of an appeal of sentence of death under this section.

"§ 3596. Implementation of sentence of death

"A person who has been sentenced to death pursuant to this chapter shall be committed to the custody of the Attorney General until exhaustion of the procedures for appeal of the judgment of conviction and for review of

the sentence. When the sentence is to be implemented, the Attorney General shall release the person sentenced to death to the custody of a United States marshal, who shall supervise implementation of the sentence in the manner prescribed by law of the State in which the sentence is imposed. If the law of such State does not provide for implementation of a sentence of death, the court shall designate another State, the law of which does so provide, and the sentence shall be implemented in the manner prescribed by such law. A sentence of death shall not be carried out upon a person who lacks the mental capacity to understand the death penalty and why it was imposed on that person, or upon a woman while she is pregnant.

"§ 3597. Use of State facilities

"A United States marshal charged with supervising the implementation of a sentence of death may use appropriate State or local facilities for the purpose, may use the services of an appropriate State or local official or of a person such as an official employed for the purpose, and shall pay the costs thereof in the amount approved by the Attorney General."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER ANALYSIS.—Title 18, United States Code, is amended in the chapter analysis of part II, by adding the following new item after the item relating to chapter 227:

"228. Death penalty procedures 3591".

SAVINGS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. LAROCOCO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAROCOCO. Mr. Speaker, We're going to hear a lot about imports and exports in the next few weeks as Congress confronts the NAFTA agreement.

Not all imports are bad. The United States imports goods and services from other countries for many good reasons. We import minerals that don't exist within our borders. We import foods that can't be grown in our climate. We import products that are made more efficiently abroad.

The right import choices can work to the advantage of American consumers and the U.S. economy.

On the other hand, the wrong import choices can hurt our economy and our country.

I believe that we are making an import choice right now that hurts this country and—in the long run, if we overdo it—can destroy us as a nation.

What is this dangerous commodity?

It's not a strategic mineral that we've become dependent on. It's not a dangerous pesticide or a weapons system.

The dangerous commodity we're bringing into our country is the savings of people from all over the world—which the United States is forced to import because Americans don't save enough money to meet the needs of our economy.

Let me be clear: It's not unusual for accounts to be out of balance in any given year. Showing a small net import

of money now and then, and a small net export of money during other years is not a cause for great concern.

But ever since 1987, this country has been a net importer of money every single year, and we import more and more every year. We are a debtor nation, like Peru or Togo.

As the economists would say: "The U.S. net international investment position shows an annual savings inflow." In 1980, we had a positive position of \$392.5 billion. Currently, we have negative position: minus \$521.3 billion.

Why did our country become a money importer, and why is this a problem?

The United States has to import capital because individuals, businesses and government in this country use more money than we have available for them domestically. This foreign capital is simply the savings that people in other countries set aside to invest.

It is something individuals abroad create and sell to us for a profit, just like cars or crops. If we think of savings as a crop, Americans eat a lot of it, but grow very little.

In 1981, Americans saved 6.3 percent of our gross domestic product. Last year, we collectively saved 3.6 percent.

Despite tax cuts and high interest rates in the 1980's, personal savings did not rise.

You would think that lower taxes would free up money in the family budget, and that a high return on savings would encourage people to put that extra money into some form of savings, but the numbers tell a different story—since the mid-eighties, Americans have never reached a savings rate as high as even 4½ percent.

Economists call this a preference for current versus future consumption. I call it betting the farm.

Since our desire for current consumption grows and grows, and our ability to pay for it isn't growing, we borrow money from foreigners to pay for our current consumption, and we apparently hope to keep borrowing from abroad to pay for future consumption.

So far, we have been able to borrow money overseas. It's a compliment, a sign of foreigners' confidence in our country's stability that they're willing to send their money here. So far, we have been able to keep up with our growing rate of domestic spending—and this is important, because current consumption isn't just money we spend going out to dinner. It's also the money we spend on new plants and modernized machinery and worker training.

And, of course, it's the money we use to finance the Federal deficit. Americans used to say that the national debt was just money we owed to ourselves—that's not true anymore. It hasn't been true since 1987.

The problem with being in everybody else's pocket is that when money is

being imported, foreigners have claims on us. And interest and dividend income attributable to foreign-owned capital tends to be exported back to the country where the capital originated. So the cycle continues.

Mr. Speaker, saving money is not just a matter of good personal discipline or sensible family budgeting. It is a matter of national survival.

Experience has shown that lower taxes don't lead to adequate savings. Higher rates of return don't lead to adequate savings.

Even the shock of becoming a debtor nation didn't lead to adequate savings.

We can see that investment capital is not a crop that grows in our present climate. Based on the nationwide economic experiments of the 1980's, we have data to show what has failed to increase savings. Now we have to figure out what will lead to adequate savings.

I intend to explore this issue, and to share information about savings with this House in the months to come.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2401, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-236) on the resolution (H. Res. 248) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2401) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1850

OUR TROOPS SHOULDN'T BE IN SOMALIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this body currently is in the midst of considering the annual Department of Defense authorization legislation, and is slowly beginning discussions on such weighty issues as when and under what circumstances the United States should deploy our military forces in the post-cold-war era. When should the United States participate in U.N. peacekeeping operations? Should we be sending troops abroad for humanitarian missions? These are important and timely matters that must be addressed.

With this in mind, this Member would direct his comments toward the continuing United States participation in the Somalia peacekeeping operation. This Member supported former Presi-

dent Bush's initiative to bring humanitarian relief to the starving people of that strife-torn country. However, this Member is equally firm in his belief that the Clinton administration's escalation of our military involvement in Somalia is misguided and inappropriate.

On May 25, 1993, this Member came before this body to explain my opposition to the joint resolution which authorized the further use of United States Armed Forces in Somalia. At that time, this Member reminded his colleagues that President Bush in December explicitly stated that our forces were sent to Somalia to assure that food and other humanitarian relief could be delivered by various organizations. Surely without that support hundreds of thousands of additional Somalis would have starved or been killed. Moreover, President Bush and his administration spokespersons were equally clear that our forces were not sent as a peacekeeping force or to disarm the warring factions except as was necessary to perform their primary hunger relief mission.

This humanitarian mission was largely accomplished by early 1993, but U.N. Secretary General Boutros-Ghali had more ambitious objectives. Regrettably, the Clinton administration permitted him to first stall the planned U.S. withdrawal and then it agreed to a continued U.S. troop presence. This Member joined with many of his colleagues—and, indeed, many Americans—in speaking frequently against an expansion of that limited American mission. However, as soon as President Bush sent our forces to Somalia various parts of the national media, the U.N. Secretary General, and other would-be opinion leaders—including some Members of this body—immediately set up a clamor to expand that United States role and broaden the interpretation of the Bush Presidential mission statement.

Since there are at least a dozen or more other hot spots around the globe where civil war and anarchy reign, these questions should be asked. Why do we have a role to restore order and civil government in Somalia and not the other places? Are we willing and able to be the policeman for the world? Is it wise? Is the U.S. national interest directly involved? How long will it take for American forces, hailed as heroes upon arrival, to be seen as the threatening outside troops which are lined up as targets in the gunshots of local combatants or terrorists? Or, as Senator SAM NUNN put it in his recent visit to Offutt Air Force Base: "People are now talking about having a military presence there until Somalia is stabilized; when was Somalia last stabilized," he asked?

Even after Defense Secretary Aspin struggled to better define the specific mission and length of deployment of

United States troops in Somalia, the New York Times, no foe of the Clinton administration, said:

Americans have not just a right but an obligation to demand that the Clinton administration explain what compelling national purpose justified such risks to the lives of U.S. soldiers and Somalia civilians caught in the crossfire.

The emerging wider range of U.N. peacekeeping operations in the post-cold-war era is a healthy and much-needed evolution of U.N. behavior. But this Member would once again repeat his views that the only way the United States can realistically participate in these new peacekeeping operations is if these peacekeeping missions for U.S. forces have the full support of the American people. We will never build public support if troops are dispatched for indeterminate periods, or if the mission of United States-deployed units continues to change as it has in Somalia during the Clinton administration.

Mr. Speaker, it was a mistake to expand the mission beyond the dire emergency feeding of Somalis to the larger role of United States combat forces serving as peacekeepers. Now we see that it was quite probably a tragic mistake as more Americans and U.N. troops are killed or wounded. As this Member has repeatedly warned, there is little prospect that peace can be kept or enforced in the long term and little likelihood that a system of civil government can be recreated in a number of years which will be adequate to return law and order, peace, and even a modicum of economic stability in Somalia. The Clinton administration listened to the harping of the national media elite and armchair interventionists who almost without exception have never served in a combat role. In doing so, the United States has been led into a progressive series of well-intended but mistaken actions. Thus it is that the Clinton administration has wandered into an enlarged mission for our Armed Forces in Somalia. It is likely to lead to a long-term commitment and tactically indefensible conditions. With each new action of the United States Ranger forces or other United States or U.N. forces, we look more like a foreign aggressor to the Somali people, and the despicable warlords and their killers mistakenly look more like the defenders of local autonomy against foreign troops.

In her nationally syndicated column, Marianne Means not only sharply criticized the Clinton administration for enlarging the mission beyond the delivery of food to starving people. She said, "Somalia smells like Vietnam, potentially an ever-expanding nightmare on inhospitable terrain." In general the Vietnam analogy is overused, but that does not make it always inaccurate; some of the lessons of Vietnam can be accurately applied to Somalia.

Of course, there will be embarrassment in some quarters about pulling our troops out of Somalia, just as there was when we beat a hasty retreat from Beirut. There the barracks blast tragically killed hundreds of U.S. Marines who were sitting ducks in a ridiculously vulnerable position while serving in an ill-advised noncombatant role. But, Ms. Means reminded us of Senator George Aiken's advice to Lyndon Johnson about the Vietnam war: "Declare victory and go home."

Mr. Speaker, the food has been successfully delivered to the Somali. Our intervention did not solve all the problems of that nation, but we saved hundreds of thousands of lives as intended. It is way past time for the United States to declare victory in Somalia and go home.

A PROGRESS REPORT ON RENEWING AMERICAN CIVILIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk this evening on a progress report to my colleagues on renewing American civilization. Back in January, I came to the floor and reported on the idea that renewing American civilization was the central challenge for our generation, now that the Soviet empire had collapsed, and when we look at the terrible problems we have in our inner cities with violence; when we look at the report today, for example, that some 90 million Americans do not read well enough to have a good job in the world market, when we look at all the different concerns we have in this country, the concept that there is an American civilization and that it needs to be renewed is very central to where we must go as a country.

At that time I suggested there was a very simple test to ascertain whether or not we needed to renew American civilization. I suggested three propositions: first, that no civilization can survive with 12-year-olds having babies, 15-year-olds killing each other, 17-year-olds dying of AIDS, and 18-year-olds getting diplomas they cannot read, and that therefore, this is not about Republican or Democrat, about liberal or conservative. This was about the very survival of American civilization as we have known it.

Of course, that reference to 18-year-olds getting diplomas they cannot read was emphasized this morning by the article pointing out that some 90 million Americans cannot read well enough to really have a job competitive in the world market with a good income.

My second proposition was that the welfare state had failed; not that it needed to be repaired, not that it need-

ed to be propped up, not that it was underfunded, but that it failed, and that the welfare state had failed for a very basic reason, that you cannot reduce a citizen to a client, subordinate them to a bureaucrat, and subject them to regulations that are anti-family, anti-work, anti-property, and anti-opportunity without creating social pathologies. And that most of the ills we see most tragically in the inner city, and see to a considerable extent in places like rural Appalachia where there has been generations of the welfare state, that those tragedies are in fact direct results of the welfare state. They are not consequences of the welfare state, they are not from the absence of a welfare state.

□ 1900

The third proposition then, if you believe that the welfare state has failed, and you believe that civilization is at stake, the third proposition was that we in our generation have an obligation to replace the welfare state, not just to oppose it, not just to tell horror stories, but in fact to develop a road map for the replacement of the welfare state.

I started with those basic ideas, and I suggested at the time that there were five principles that guide American civilization.

First, personal strength, that if you do not have the key ingredients of personal strength, integrity, courage, discipline, perseverance, hard work, if you do not have those characteristics that you cannot survive either in a free market or in a free society, because the individual has to have a considerable amount of personal discipline, personal commitment, personal courage for a free society to operate and for a free market to operate.

Second, the entrepreneurial free enterprise, the spirit of getting the job done is very essential to America, that whether it is in the private sector for profit, whether it is in the military as in Desert Storm, whether it is in science in the laboratory as in Jonas Salk's inventing a vaccine, the fact is that simply having the drive, the focus to get the job done is a very important part of America. And as we become more and more bureaucratic, as people have focused not on getting the job done but on simply doing the process, punching the card, filling in the forms, that in fact America has begun to lose energy. And I must say Vice President GORE's efforts at reinventing Government have much of the same language, much of the same approach as entrepreneurial free enterprise in the renewing American civilization model.

Third, we talked about the spirit of invention and technology, the whole idea that going out and discovering new things, going out and creating new opportunities, going out and learning whether it is in space, or in the ocean,

or in science, whether it is inventing something as simple as the stickup cards that people now make, the paper you can put up on the wall of your refrigerator when you write phone numbers, or it is something as complex as a brand-new computer, all of these different kinds of inventions, the spirit of Benjamin Franklin, or Thomas Edison, of the Wright Brothers, that that spirit of discovery and invention is a very, very real part of America and what makes it work.

Fourth, we talked about the concept of quality largely as defined by Edwards Deming, but also Dr. Juran, and by Phil Crosby, people who had developed the ideas that we must work together as a team, that work is a system, and that there is a direct relationship from your suppliers and your workers all the way through to your customers, and that every person who participates has an ownership and a chance to improve every day the work they are doing, that that concept of quality could revolutionize government, could revolutionize opportunities for learning, could revolutionize our health system.

Then finally we talked about the lessons of American history, the concept that this has been the most successful civilization in the history of the world in liberating people, and that while we have problems, and we do, while we have difficulties in integrating races as much as we would like, and integrating cultures as much as we would like, while we have difficulties making sure every American has the right to pursue happiness, that nonetheless, on aggregate, more Americans have more opportunities to pursue more happiness, to do more things, to have more choices than any country in the history of the world, and that people from a wider range of backgrounds, here in the Congress HENRY BONILLA, who has a Hispanic background working from San Antonio, JAY KIM, a Korean-American background serving from California, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, a Cuban-American background serving from Florida, GARY FRANKS of an African-American background serving Connecticut, each of these coming together, representing a broad range of backgrounds, but seeing themselves as an American, working together, creating better opportunities for the future.

So we suggested those five principles, personal strength, entrepreneurial free enterprise, the spirit of invention and discovery, quality, and lessons of American history could then be applied to solve problems. And we suggested four specific areas to solve.

First, economic growth and jobs in the world market. How do we create jobs for the future? How do we create better jobs with better take-home pay, with a higher standard of living?

Second, health. What do we do about 14 percent of our gross national product, life and death, a considerable concern about senior citizens with long-term care? What do we do about health?

Third, saving the inner cities, the proposition that America cannot ever be healthy if its great cities are centers of decay and death, the notion when it took the length of time of December and January that it took for 3 Americans to be killed in Somalia and 48 were killed in our National Capital, in the District of Columbia. The whole idea that the level of violence, the level of degradation, the level of abuse and destructiveness that you see every night on every television news in every city in America simply is not tolerable in a civilized country. And we have to find a way to save the inner cities, and saving them means healthy neighborhoods, safe neighborhoods, neighborhoods with jobs, neighborhoods with schools that work, neighborhoods with housing that is decent, neighborhoods that people can live in with pride and know that as an American they are truly endowed with inalienable rights.

Finally, the concept of citizenship. Here we are in the electronic age with C-SPAN and CNN, and faxes, and computers, with telephone conference calls and jet airplanes, and we have to rethink what does it mean to be a citizen when you live in a world where your neighbors are on a Rolodex. They are not next door, and you may be traveling all over the world. You may be getting some of your information by fax, some by mail, some by newspapers and magazines, some by radio or television. How do we organize citizenship for the 21st century?

Those were the concepts we wanted to focus on. And I said at the time I wanted to teach a course. I felt that the only way to develop a replacement for the welfare state, to create a road map for the future was to work at an intellectual level, to work with people who think about ideas and develop ideas, and to develop an approach which would be open to everybody, to Republicans, to Democrats, to independents, to Libertarians, to people of all backgrounds, liberal, conservative, to create an opportunity to talk about ideas and to find a way to renew American civilization.

During that period I was very fortunate in that I talked with Dean Tim Mescon at the school of business at Kennesaw State College, and they agreed to allow me to teach at Kennesaw State College. I might say in passing that I have a Ph.D. in history. I taught 9 years, 8 in the University of Georgia system and 1 year at Tulane University where I got my degree, and I had a background in college teaching. So we developed a 20-hour course. We took those basic ideas I have outlined. First, the concept that there is an

American civilization, and then the five principles, and then the four specific areas to focus on, and then we developed a course that will start on September 18, and which will be available for 2 hours each Saturday by satellite for anybody in America who has a downlink or cable system or wants to take the course. In addition, the course will be available by audiotape and by videotape for anyone in America who wants to get the course. So we made available a very wide range for anybody who wants to participate to be involved in studying the concept of renewing American civilization.

The course is being taught for credit at Kennesaw State College. I am also very pleased to tell my colleagues that it is being offered for credit at the Porterville College in Porterville, CA, at Clemson University in Clemson, SC, at Lee College in Cleveland, TN, at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard. It is not being offered for credit there, but it is being offered as a non-required class by Marty Connors, who is a fellow at Kennedy School of Government who is part of a class called electronic democracy. And it is being offered for credit at the University of California at Berkeley.

In addition to those 6 sites, counting Kennesaw State College in Kennesaw, GA, there are another 126 sites around the country which are already signed up for the course which begins on September 18. After teaching the course this fall, we will come back and teach *Renewing American Civilization* again in January of 1994. We will then spend 9 months studying and rethinking and rewriting the course, and we will teach it again in January of 1995. We will then study and rethink it one last time, and we will try to teach it again in January 1996.

We have three goals, public policy goals about our civilization, not about politics, not about elections, but about rethinking how we renew American civilization and developing a road map to replace the welfare state.

Our first goal is to genuinely create an intellectually serious and thoughtful road map for replacing the welfare state, to truly explore the principles that make up American civilization, and to create an opportunity for people to look at what we could be doing instead of what we are doing.

□ 1910

Second, to develop across the country at least 200,000 students who have participated in thinking about the process of renewing American civilization and who are committed to the idea that in a giant, continentwide, decentralized country you have to be able to renew your civilization at school board and county commission and city council, at State legislature and the Congress, that it is not just the President, not just the Governor, not just the

mayor, that it is the full participation at every level of citizenship. It is getting out there and really trying to change things across the board simultaneously.

Third, frankly, we hope to do what may be the most difficult of all things, which is to actually operate programs sufficiently interesting and sufficiently powerful that the news media will actually study substance instead of style and that they actually would be willing to learn new ideas and new language and really think about what American civilization is all about and how to work with it.

Now, in that context let me say that we developed working with McGraw-Hill and their college custom series, a book entitled "*Readings in Renewing American Civilization*." That is by Dr. Jeffrey Eisenach and Steve Hanser. As some very prestigious contributors: Keith Butler, a city councilman in Detroit; and Stephen Corey, who has a best-selling book on the seven habits of highly effective people; George Gilder, who of course has written a number of important books on technology and entrepreneurship; Regina Herzlinger, a professor at the Harvard School of Business; Maryanne Huffington, who is a serious scholar of culture and who has written a number of major books, including a very renowned biography of Picasso; by George Keyworth, who was the science adviser to President Reagan, and a nationally known physicist; by Dr. Everett Carl Ladd, who may be our most distinguished student of American opinion and one of the truly creative thinkers in American culture and American civilization; Dr. Barbara Lawton, who is a protege of Dr. Edward Standing, one of the most knowledgeable people on the concept of quality in the entire United States; and by John Rutledge, a leading economist and one of the real students of how to get the economy going together.

This is a very serious work. It runs about 250 pages. It outlines across the board the principles and the core ideas that relate to renewing American civilization, and we are, frankly, going to be using it in class and are going to be making it available for a wide range of people who are interested in looking at these new ideas.

In addition to that, we put together and developed an advisory committee that we think is outstanding, people who have agreed to look at these ideas and to develop them, leading academic intellectual students from across the country: Dr. James K. Wilson, University of California at Los Angeles, who may be the leading student of crime and of society in America. He has a number of books to his credit and is widely regarded, I think, as one of the most serious students in American political science today. He is helping us particularly in the area of personal

strength. We have Dr. Mike Moscone, the former dean at Georgia State University's School of Business and a very distinguished business consultant in his own right, who is advising us on entrepreneurial free enterprise; Bill Wattley, a very, very important student of technology, who is advising us on science and technology and who is from Scientific Atlanta, one of the leading scientific exporting companies in Georgia, who is helping us to look through; and particularly in that entire area, Dr. Barbara Lawton, whom I mentioned earlier, who is advising us on quality; Dr. Everett Carl Ladd who is advising us on the whole issue of lessons of American history and how we are to apply that. On economic growth we have Larry Kudlow, senior economist of Bear, Sterns, former senior economist of the Office of Management and Budget, who has thought long and hard about how to create jobs in America and how to make sure we are competitive in the world market.

We have Dr. Gail Wilensky, former head of the Health Care Finance Administration, former deputy director of domestic policy in the White House for President Bush, a person widely recognized as a real expert in that area.

On saving the inner city, Keith Butler, mentioned earlier as a city councilman in Detroit, a real reform manager, leader in thinking through what we need to do to save America's inner cities.

Finally, on citizenship in the 21st century, Dr. Larry Sabato, at the University of Virginia, probably the best known and most often quoted student of political parties in America today.

Now, seven of those nine have now agreed to participate. We have not heard back from the two yet. In a review session on December 4 in Georgia, the way this is going to work: We are developing an entire course. We are sharing it with our senior advisers, making it available to anyone who is interested, as I said earlier, anyone who is a Democrat, Republican, a Libertarian, of any background, who is interested in the concept of renewing American civilization, who wants to find ways to replace the welfare state.

Then, having taught the course for the first time we are going to spend an entire day with our senior advisers and any of the participants from the courses who want to come, and we are going to review the ideas again and begin to rewrite the course.

Then all through the winter quarter starting in January 1994 we are going to redevelop and rethink the ideas and reteach it. Then with the help of our senior advisers and other folks who have agreed to counsel us, we are going to spend all of 1994, after we have taught the course, rewriting it again. Then we are going to come back, teach it in 1995, have another conference to revise it, and then spend 9 months re-

vising it and teach it again in January 1996.

Now, let me explain why I think this is so important to approach it as an intellectual project, not as a Rotary Club speech, not as a political speech on the House floor, not as a 30-second TV commercial, but 20 hours of lectures and outlines and ideas backed up by a book of readings and other assignments.

I believe that the greatest failure in American politics today is not money, it is not courage, it is not willpower; it is ideas. I believe that the scale of our problem, the fact that the bureaucracy is now totally obsolete in the information age, the fact that the welfare state has failed at its very core because of its misunderstanding of human nature, the fact that we have, frankly, gone further and further in the wrong direction toward a redistributionist, high-taxed, bureaucratic-dominated, socialist system, which is exactly the wrong direction, the direction that failed in Russia, the direction that is failing in Italy, the direction which was repudiated in this year's election in France, the direction that led to the collapse of the Liberal Democratic Party in Japan. That what in fact we need to do is to get back to the basics of American civilization.

Those basics start with a strong individual and a strong family, strong community and a strong neighborhood. Those basics start with a strong sense of faith, a belief in God, and a notion that we want freedom of religion; we do not want freedom against religion; the notion that you want to encourage people to work and that without the work ethic it is virtually impossible to have a healthy America; that you want to encourage and award people for working; that you want people to be able to go out and start businesses, create jobs, and have better opportunities; that you are insistent, you are adamant, you are determined at any cost to create safety; that if you cannot protect people, if you have 5-year-olds being killed randomly, 15-year-olds, as happened in Atlanta last week where a girl was taken off, abducted, tortured for 3 days, and then killed brutally by eight teenagers; if you cannot physically defend your citizens, you cannot maintain civilization.

So there are core needs here. There is a need for us to recognize the scale of the change. And when you do recognize how gigantic that change is, described best, I think, by Alvin Toffler in a famous book that talked of the Third Wave, which talks about going from an industrial society to an information society as a change that is fully as large a shift, for example, from hunting/gathering to agriculture and from agriculture to industry, a giant scale of change in the 18th and 19th centuries as we went from living on a farm, traveling by horse and having stagecoaches to having airplanes, railroads and

steamships, and now you think about the same scale jump and you begin to understand while Vice President GORE's reinventing Government was a good start, it was a baby step. It was tiny step No. 1 in a journey of a thousand steps. What we have to understand is what is our destination, where are we going? The purpose of renewing American civilization is to go into an academic environment and create an intellectual framework for thinking about where we are going.

□ 1920

We have to understand that it has to start with the basics. When you talk about economic growth and jobs in the world market, you have to take all five of the principles, personal strength, entrepreneurial enterprise, the spirit of invention, discovery, quality, and the lessons of American history and weave all five of them into a synergism and say here is how we can maximize American inventiveness, American entrepreneurship, American energy, American drive, American ingenuity, so that we can create the best jobs with the highest value in the entire world, so that we can compete with anybody anywhere.

When you talk about health, what worries me most from everything I have heard, and this includes a meeting I was in this afternoon, is that the Clinton administration which talks at times as though it has studied under Ronald Reagan, but plans and acts as though it has studied under Governor Dukakis, they are going to develop a health plan which is more bureaucracy, more centralized control, higher taxes, more redtape, and what we know is that a Government-run health system will not work.

Well, if that is true that the current health system is a mess, what is the model we need? What kind of health system should we have?

I think you have to go back to those same five basic principles. You have to start with a sense of personal responsibility. You have to own your health care. You have to have ownership of your health. You have to have choice. You have to be responsible.

People say it is too complicated. Folks go out every day and they pick their careers. They buy a house that may cost \$100,000 or \$200,000 thousand dollars. They buy a new car. We make many decisions as consumers. We vote for a President and a Congress and a Governor and a legislature, and yet we are told, "Gee, you're not smart enough to understand health care." Nonsense.

What you have got to do is rethink from the ground up, starting with personal strength. If we really want personal responsibility, we would have a health care system where you could simply look up every doctor and every hospital in your area. You would know

what their history was of treating certain illnesses, how much they charge, what the outcomes are like. That kind of data is available, but you cannot find it anywhere today, because we do not think about making it possible for every American to have control over their own health care and have their own choice.

We go through a series of changes. We emphasize preventive care. We know that a dollar spent on a pregnant woman helping her make sure that the baby is okay is probably worth between a hundred and two hundred dollars in care in a neonatal unit or in a unit for a baby that is born prematurely.

Now, we know that, and yet we simply do not go out and methodically and practically organize so that we can take advantage of that fact and save a lot of money.

We know that there are a lot of things we could do to make health care dramatically less expensive, not by having some bureaucrat establish another piece of paper, another regulation, but instead by encouraging and exciting people into the very same spirit of competition which lowers the price of Wal-Mart and Sears Roebuck and Kmart, which lowers the price at our local grocery stores, which is exactly the opposite direction from where the Clinton Task Force on Health is going.

So there are possibilities here for better health at lower cost.

When you talk about saving the inner cities, you have to start with personal responsibility. Nothing is going to be done in America to replace the welfare state unless we start first with how to encourage people to be personally responsible. How do we encourage families to stay together? How do we encourage society to be peaceful and nonviolent. How do we encourage a system in which predators, such as the person who killed the German tourist in Miami two nights ago, are not allowed back on the streets.

How do we develop a system where people who are innocent are safe and people who are criminals are locked up? That is a very different world.

We have to make sure that we take the whole current welfare system and replace it so that you have every incentive to work, every incentive to prosper, every incentive to have more opportunities, every incentive to study and you have access to schools that work where you can in fact learn something and have a chance for a better future.

Finally, in that framework, what does being a citizen mean? What should we expect from you? We have a lot of people who are mad at Washington, and I certainly join them in thinking that we need a lot of changes, but we also have a need to say to the citizen, "And what are you going to do? What responsibilities do you have?"

In many ways the most famous of all the American systems is the New Hampshire town hall meeting and the New England town hall meeting where everybody gets together once a year and they review the entire local township budget and they have a real sense of control and a real sense of impact and a real sense of involvement.

Well, that is the ideal model. Now how do we take that for a country of 260 million people scattered all across the continent who live in an electronic age, and how do we develop ways for citizens to be involved?

Let me suggest that C-SPAN is an important first step. One of the reasons I wanted to teach this course in renewing American civilization by satellite and make it available everywhere and also make it available by audiotape and by videotape was to make the point to people that we have got to get in the habit of thinking electronically and we have to get in the habit of reaching out to everyone in real time and making it easily accessible in your living room to do the things you want.

Now, I have been talking with Pete Jensen of Georgia Tech and some other experts on information sciences, and they have been making the point to me that we are on the verge of being able to create an information utility.

Now, what do I mean by information utility? This has direct relevance both to the scale of change we need when we get to phase 2 of Vice President GORE's reinventing Government and to the way we ought to rethink learning and health care and bureaucracy and, for example, public safety.

An information utility would be a little bit like the telephone is today or like your television set is. You know, when you go into your home now you do not think of the microwave as magic. You do not think of the mixer that you might have as magic. You do not think of your telephone as magic. It is just something you use. It is practical. It is handy and you are used to it.

Well, the concept of an information utility is that it should be possible within the next 5 years to develop a system much like a combination of your television and your telephone, which enables you to control it, to dominate it. I do not say user friendly, because I find user friendly is a term computer people use when they mean it is going to take people like you and me a long time to figure it out. I mean a system where literally you control it the same way you now control your microwave oven or the same way you now control your telephone, where you are comfortable with it.

In that setting, imagine that you could get up in the morning or any time of the day that you felt like it, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and first of all you had access to all the information you wanted.

You need to go get retrained because your company is phasing out your job? You get access to your home utility.

You need to learn more about how to read because you are one of those 90 million Americans who we are told by this morning's newspaper is not very good at reading. You have direct access to courses on reading that are right there, that are available, that are a combination of computer and video tape and personal training, but it is done in your living room at your convenience, when you want to do it, under your control.

You begin to think maybe you need some medical help. There is no reason that a tremendous quantity of information that is currently not available to the average citizen could not be made available by computer.

You are a young girl and you think you might be pregnant. Where is the nearest prenatal clinic?

You are a person getting older and you think you might have a problem with Alzheimer's. First of all, how can you learn about it? How can you get access?

Second, where is the nearest facility that has really good experts who can talk to you about it? What kind of advice can you get?

There are a thousand ways in which using electronics intelligently and creatively we can link people together.

It should bother all of us that the simplest and easiest ways of using computers today are games. I mean no disrespect to Nintendo and Sega and all the people who have done a brilliant job creating a future.

My good friend, Congressman JOHN KASICH, was down in Atlanta last weekend. We went to Dave and Buster's, which is a local arcade and restaurant complex. We played Virtual Realities. It was the first time we ever played it. It is magnificent. It is wonderful. It is fascinating. You put on a helmet. You are holding a gun and you are right in the middle of a game with a computer and you are in a computerized simulated world, and so are three other people and you are able to do all sorts of things. It was fascinating.

But if we can do that for fun, if we can do that for amusement, if we can do that for entertainment, why can we not with a little imagination offer some prizes for the best educational games, so that while you are having a good time, you are learning about Brazil or you are learning about history or you are learning about political science, so you begin to get involved in an interactive real-time dynamic process that dramatically expands the ability to learn, the ability to know, the ability to seek information.

All I am suggesting is that we are at the edge of this gigantic revolution, that the combination of technology and science on the one side, entrepreneurship and the spirit of getting a job

done, the concept of quality, the idea of personal responsibility and the work ethic and the things that have made America work, and then learning to think once again like the Founding Fathers and like the people who made America great.

I go back in a sense to Franklin Roosevelt, a man who I regard as the greatest President of the 20th century. Roosevelt said in his first Inaugural that we have nothing to fear but fear itself. He promised that the effort to create a better America might often fail, but it would never stop, that they would experiment and experiment until they began to get things better. It took great courage. It was the right approach.

We need to insist that our goal is to replace the welfare state. We need to insist that our goal is to renew American civilization. We need to rethink earning from the ground up. We need to make the best learning in the world available to every American from the poorest to the richest, from the most urban to the most rural.

A high school in Carrollton, GA, offers Japanese by satellite from the University of Nebraska.

□ 1930

Now that can be made available everywhere. If we are creative and clever, if we are willing to rethink the whole structure of how we do things, we could literally, within 3 or 4 years, dramatically expand for every American their opportunities, their chance to have a good job and their chance to learn all their lives, and, if we do not do that, we are not going to compete in the world market. We are not going to create jobs, and we are not going to have an American civilization we can be proud of.

Now in that framework, with this scale of dramatic change available, with the kind of things we need to think through, what I am suggesting is not that Newt Gingrich is going to teach this class, but I am going to begin the dialogue, working with people like Lamar Alexander, the former Secretary of Education, and Bill Bennett who before him was the Secretary of Education, Jack Kemp, who was the leading advocate of economic growth in jobs and who then served as Secretary of Housing and Urban Development where he was, I think, literally a heroic figure in beginning to carry hope, and opportunity and a belief that poor people would own their own homes, and manage their own projects and have control over their own lives, that bringing together people of that caliber, working with Brett Schundler, the new mayor of Jersey City, who I believe is the most important Republican in America today because he represents a dramatic breakthrough, and Brett Schundler is a perfect example of what I am talking about.

Mr. Speaker, this is a young man who was originally a Gary Hart field man, who was a new-ideas Democrat who decided to change parties after Governor Dukakis was nominated because he gave up on the Democratic Party, who found himself running for mayor in a special election when the mayor of Jersey City ascended to jail. He was one of 19 candidates. He won with 16 percent of the vote. It was the first time since 1904 that a Republican was elected mayor of Jersey City, and in a city which is 70 percent Democrat, 6 percent Republican, a city in which 41 percent of all citizens speak a language other than English at home. Brett Schundler had such courage and such commitment. He went out and used such common sense, innovative, radical ideas that, when he, at 9 months later, ran in an election against the Democratic machine, he personally got 68 percent of the vote, and he elected nine out of nine city council members. All nine are reform oriented, new ideas, replace the welfare state approach.

Now he has a lot of new ideas. He happens to be, for example, in favor of school choice so that people have the option to go to the school that works, and he believes that parents should have the right to send their child to a school that works, and he is prepared to give them a voucher to enable them to do that. He has dramatically changed the police force to get more policemen out on the street. He has worked at newer and better ways of lowering taxes and cutting spending. He knows that creating jobs and encouraging people to come to Jersey City to open up businesses is the key to the future because, if you do not have a job, all other social policy stands to one side. The most important social goal of a society ought to be able to live in safety, and to go work, and to earn a decent living, and raise your family with your own money, and Brett Schundler is committed to that.

Similarly Bob King up in Rochester, NY, the county executive, has done dramatic new things, fascinating things, and has learned that by working hard, by being innovative, by bringing in quality from business and applying the concepts to quality that he is able to dramatically improve his county government. I will give my colleagues one example he did on a recent tape that I listened to of Bob King talking about reform in his county.

They did a study of welfare applications, and they discovered that when people came in for welfare, for public assistance, for food stamps, the worker who was dealing with them would take down all of the information by hand. That would then go up to another person in a computer room where it would sit for about 3 weeks and then finally be typed into the computer. Usually between 35 and 40 percent of the forms would have a mistake on them, a num-

ber written down wrong, a Social Security number written down wrong, an address written down wrong, some mistake. The person in the computer room would then submit all that to the New York State central computer for welfare which would then about 35 to 40 percent of the time send out a letter to the person who was getting their food stamps telling them they were now kicked off the food stamp roll because based on the false information in the computer they were not eligible. They would then come, anxiety ridden, rushing into the welfare office where the case worker would go upstairs, pick up the file, print out a copy, go downstairs and discover what the mistake was.

Now they were having to rework 35 to 40 percent of the applications because they had this two-step process. Bob King's obvious commonsense idea was: What if we were to bring the computer right down to the desk so that, when you talk directly to the welfare worker, they were typing directly into the computer, and you could then come around the desk, and look at the computer screen, and you could proofread your own information, or, if you are not literate, you could have it read to you at this moment by the welfare worker so that at that second, while you were standing there, the correct information could go into the New York State central computer. That one change, bringing the information down from upstairs to the desk of the intake worker by itself would eliminate, first of all, half the jobs. They would no longer have the computer input person sitting upstairs. Second, it would eliminate between 35 and 40 percent of the applications having an error.

Now that is the kind of innovative, commonsense, practical change which is what Dr. Deming means when he talks about continuous improvement as part of the key to quality, not that any one of them is a giant breakthrough, but that inch by inch, step by step, it is possible to create a whole new way of doing things and a whole new approach.

I wanted to report to my colleagues on the concept of renewing American civilization and on the course that we are going to teach because I believe it is a very important step in the right direction. I think it is fascinating, for example, that David Woodard, the Clemson professor who is going to be given the course at Clemson as part of the project, said that they filled the course to overflowing within 48 hours; he drew the line at 50 people, but that there were at least 200 students who wanted to take the course, and I hope that they are going to be able to offer it in a bigger room winter quarter when we teach it for the second time. I think it is fascinating that the opportunity is here for us to develop a dramatic breakthrough in new ideas and new approaches.

Now I want to again emphasize, if you look at "Readings in Renewing American Civilization," and you look at the last section, our appendix, which is our syllabus and selected readings, which actually runs from page 230 to page 251, you are going to find a very wide range of books. You are going to find a lot of different suggestions on things to look at. Let me just give my colleagues, for example, on class one: understanding American civilization. This introductory lecture provides an overview of the course, outlines the essential components of American civilization that make it unique and explains why an understanding of American history and the principles of American life is essential for effective citizenship. That opening 2 hours, which will be on September 18 at 8:30 in the morning has as its first required reading, I may say immodestly, the introduction I wrote to "Renewing American Civilization", which outlines the concepts, but then we have source documents to understand American civilization, and this is the only chapter that I am going to list, but I just want to read in this list from this one chapter, this one class, that gives people a sense of the breadth and the scale of what we are interested in. Source Documents and Further Reading for class one, Understanding American Civilization: the Bible (any version); the Constitution of the United States; the Declaration of Independence; Michael Barone, "Our Country"; Daniel J. Boorstin, "The Americans: The Colonial Experience"; "The Americans: The National Experience"; "The Americans: The Democratic Experience"; Alexander Hamilton, et al., "The Federalist Papers"; W.J. Hoxie, "How Girls Can Help Their Country: The 1913 Handbook for Girl Scouts"; Samuel P. Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations," Foreign Affairs (Summer 1993); Martin Luther King, "I Have a Dream: Writings and Speeches that Changed the World"; Russell Kirk, "America's British Culture."

Nicholas Lemann, "The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration and How It Changed America"; Max Lerner, "America as a Civilization"; William McNeill, "The Rise of the West"; Ronald W. Reagan, "First Inaugural Address" (January 20, 1981) in "Inaugural Addresses of the Presidents of the United States", (Bicentennial Edition); Arthur Schlesinger, "The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society"; Henry David Thoreau, "Walden and Civil Disobedience"; Alexis de Tocqueville, "Democracy in America"; Alvin Toffler, "The Third Wave"; Benjamin J. Wattenberg, "the First Universal National: Leading Indicators and Ideas About the Surge of America in the 1990's"; Theodore H. White, "In Search of History"; Garry Wills, "Inventing America: Jefferson's Declaration of Independence"; Gordon

S. Wood, "The Radicalism of the American Revolution"; (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992), and another book by Gordon S. Wood, "The Creation of the American Republic".

Now I cite that reading list from that 1 class; this is 1 of the 10 sessions, to make 2 points: First, this is not a narrowly drawn, right wing Republican approach. This is a serious effort to try to develop on a broad base an understanding of American civilization and a sense of the principles that have made America work and an effort to really think through a road map for a place in the welfare state.

□ 1940

Second, this is an intellectual, rather than a political effort. I think all of my colleagues would agree, just looking at that one reading list, that that is hardly a brochure for reelection. That is hardly the beginning of a platform for a political party.

The reason I am saying this is that I have been extremely disappointed by some of the press coverage about the class, particularly by an extraordinarily inaccurate and false editorial in the Atlanta Journal and Constitution on September 5, which simply did not get it, which did not understand that this is a serious effort by a wide range of serious intellectuals, trying to think through where we are going.

So I wanted to reemphasize, my goal in talking this evening is to encourage every staff member in the Congress, every citizen who happens to watch on C-SPAN or read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, every one of my colleagues, to feel that they can be involved. I do not care what your party is, I do not care what your ideology is. If you agree with a handful of basic principles, first, that there is an American civilization; that while we are multi-ethnic, we are one culture, and it is called American; second, that that civilization is so important and so vital and so decisive in freedom and in giving people the opportunity to pursue happiness, that it is worth renewing; third, that the welfare state has failed and must be replaced; and, fourth, that there are basic principles to American civilization, and that by thinking through those principles and reapplying them, we can create a dramatic, dynamic, twenty-first century, that will let all of our children live better lives with better jobs, with higher take-home pay, in greater safety, and with more freedom.

If you agree with those principles, I do not care what your background is, I want your ideas, I want your advice, I want your counsel. Because together, we may be able to solve the intellectual problem of creating a road map to replace the welfare state and of defining what it means to renew American civilization.

So I simply want to take a few minutes today to report to my colleagues

that there is a course that will begin September 18, that Kennesaw College has shown enormous leadership in serving as the host; that, as I said earlier, it is being offered at 132 sites all together, including for credit at Kennesaw State College, at the University of California at Berkeley, at Lee College, at Clemson University, and at Porterville College, and it is being offered at places like Harvard and Stanford on a noncredit basis. But a wide range of groups of all kinds of backgrounds are participating. To let my colleagues know that the course will be available not only by satellite on Saturday mornings, but by audio and videotape; and, to let my colleagues know that there is a book and to let the staffs know that there is a book called "Readings in Renewing American Civilization" that is available and that really does create a framework that allows us to start thinking about these principles and these ideas.

I hope over the next few weeks to be able to report to my colleagues as the course develops and to be able to share with them the ideas and the concepts.

Then I hope that anyone who is interested, any of my colleagues, any of the staff, any of the other folks who might encounter these ideas, who are interested in joining us on December 4 in Atlanta to talk about what did we do, how can we improve it, how should it be changed, how do we develop the second course for January, I want to encourage the widest possible range of participation, because that is the only way I know to truly have a chance to renew American civilization.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, after 2 p.m.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEREUTER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes each day, on September 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, and 30, October 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29, November 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, and 30, and December 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31.

Mr. GALLEGLY, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORN, for 60 minutes each day, on September 13, 20, and 27.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for 5 minutes each day, on September 13 and 14.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KOPETSKI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LAROCO for 5 minutes each day, on September 13 and 14.

Mr. GEPHARDT for 60 minutes each day, on September 9, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, 28, 29, and 30.

Mr. HOYER, for 60 minutes, on September 13.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 60 minutes, on September 13.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEREUTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PETRI.

Mr. BEREUTER in five instances.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

Mr. SOLOMON in three instances.

Mr. HERGER.

Mr. QUILLEN.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. LEACH.

Mr. CLINGER.

Mr. HORN.

Mrs. BENTLEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KOPETSKI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OLVER in two instances.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. HOLDEN.

Ms. HARMAN.

Mr. RUSH.

Mr. DERRICK.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. SLATTERY.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Ms. ESHOO.

Mr. KLEIN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GINGRICH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GILLMOR.

Mr. CAMP.

Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. HALL of Texas.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2010. An act to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to establish a Corporation for National Service, enhance opportunities for national service, and provide national service educational awards

to persons participating in such service, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 13, 1993, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1810. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting notification of the President's intent to exempt all military personnel accounts from sequester for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(c)(4) (104 Stat. 1388-589); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1811. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report on revised estimates of the budget receipts, outlays, and budget authority for fiscal years 1993-1998, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1106(a) (H. Doc. No. 103-133); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1812. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary (Financial Management), Department of the Army, transmitting a report on the value of property, supplies, and commodities provided by the Berlin Magistrate for the quarter January 1, 1993 through March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 101-165, section 9008 (103 Stat. 1130); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1813. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting status of the President's sixth special impoundment message for fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685; (H. Doc. 103-135) to the Committee on Appropriations.

1814. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting the CBO's Sequestration Update Report for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-587); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1815. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the OMB Sequestration Update Report to the President and Congress, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-587); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1816. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of August 1, 1993, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 103-132); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1817. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting notification that certain major defense acquisition programs have breached the unit cost by more than 15 percent, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2431(b)(3)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1818. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise the authorized strength limitations for Marine Corps com-

missioned officers on active duty in the grades of major and lieutenant colonel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1819. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Department has certified the expansion of the CHAMPUS Reform Initiative to Washington and Oregon, pursuant to Public Law 102-484, section 712(c) (106 Stat. 2435); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1820. A letter from the Director, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to the Peoples Republic of China, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1821. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Review of the District of Columbia Public School System's Realty Program", pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47-117(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1822. A letter from the Office of Dependents' Education, transmitting the annual test report for school year 1992-93 for the overseas dependents' schools administered by the Department, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 924; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1823. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the fiscal year 1993 annual report of the National Advisory Council on Educational Research and Improvement, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1221e(c)(3); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1824. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the second annual report on activities under the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act aimed at meeting needs of children and youth with disabilities from minority backgrounds; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1825. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the implementation of the voluntary national child abuse and neglect data system for fiscal 1991 and 1992; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1826. A letter from the President, the American Council of Learned Societies, transmitting the Council's annual report for the year 1991-92, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(56), 1103; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1827. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting notice of the delay of the National Energy Policy Plan until April 1, 1995, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7321 (b), (c); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1828. A letter from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the final report on the activities undertaken on standard test method to determine cigarette ignition propensity, pursuant to Public Law 101-352, section 4 (104 Stat. 406); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1829. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting report on the measures taken by the Agency and by the States to implement the provisions of section 112, as amended of the Clean Air Act, pursuant to Public Law 101-549, section 301 (104 Stat. 2573); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1830. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's report entitled, "The Economic and Technical Capacity of States and Public Water Systems to Implement Drinking Water Regulations"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1831. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to Spain (Transmittal No. DTC-32-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1832. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1998 resulting from passage of H.R. 631, H.R. 798, and H.R. 2034, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101 (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1833. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1998 resulting from passage of H.R. 416, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101 (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1834. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1998 resulting from passage of H.R. 63 and H.R. 843, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1835. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the list of all reports issued or released in July 1993, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1836. A letter from the Manager, Employee Benefits, ArgiBank, transmitting the 1992 annual report of the retirement plan for the employees of the Sixth Farm Credit District, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1837. A letter from the Chairman, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1992, through March 31, 1993, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. App. 3; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1838. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the annual management report for the Commodity Credit Corporation, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1839. A letter from the Associate Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1840. A letter from the FOI Officer, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1841. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1842. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting a report pursuant to the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988 for fiscal year 1992; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1843. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB's estimate of the amount of discre-

tionary new budget authority and outlays for the current year (if any) and the budget year provided by H.R. 2348 and H.R. 2667, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-578); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1844. A letter from the Inspector General, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act of 1990 to require the additional reporting of civil penalties imposed pursuant to a Federal law which does not set forth a specific or maximum monetary amount; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1845. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting one recommendation for legislative action, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 438(d)(1); to the Committee on House Administration.

1846. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report and recommendation concerning the claim of Mr. Brad Hutchinson, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3702(d); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1847. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Bureau of Justice Assistance Police Hiring Supplement Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1848. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's annual report on the progress in implementing the Coast Guard Environmental Compliance and Restoration Program for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to Public Law 101-225, section 222(a) (103 Stat. 1918); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1849. A letter from the Secretaries of Commerce and State, transmitting the annual Foreign Allocation Report for 1992, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1821(f); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1850. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the report of progress on developing and certifying the Traffic Alert and Collision Avoidance System [TCAS], pursuant to Public Law 100-223, section 203(b) (101 Stat. 1518); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1851. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting informational copies of various lease prospectuses, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1852. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting his determination that it is in the public interest to use other than competitive procedures for the procurement of certain supplies and services from small disadvantaged businesses including women-owned businesses, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304(c)(7); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

1853. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the annual report on employment and training programs for veterans during program year 1991 (July 1, 1991 through June 30, 1992) and fiscal year 1992 (October 1, 1991 through September 30, 1992), pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 2009(b); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1854. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to restore the statutory eligibility for burial in national cemeteries of spouses who predecease individuals eligible for such burial; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1855. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Veterans' Appeals Improvement Act of 1993"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1856. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a copy of negative case actions under the program of aid to families with dependent children under State plans approved under part A of title IV of SSA, pursuant to Public Law 101-239, section 8004(g)(1) (103 Stat. 2460); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1857. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a copy of a report on States' re-evaluations of need and payment standards of AFDC child care, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 602 note; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1858. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the quarterly report on the expenditure and need for worker adjustment assistance training funds under the Trade Act of 1974, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2296(a)(2); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1859. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the annual Status Report on Credit Management and Debt Collection, dated August 1993, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3719(b); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1860. A letter from the Interim CEO, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting the status report for the month of June 1993 (The 1988-89 FSLIC Assistance Agreements), pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1411a note; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1861. A letter from the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, transmitting notification that up to \$135 million is proposed to be obligated to assist the Republic of Ukraine in activities related to dismantlement of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles and other weapons; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services.

1862. A letter from the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the Department's intent to obligate up to \$65 million to assist the Republic of Belarus in various activities related to dismantlement of strategic offensive arms; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services.

1863. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a waiver under section 9069(b)(1) of Public Law 102-396 when the Secretary determines that the waiver is necessary in the national security of the United States, pursuant to Public Law 102-396, section 9069(b)(2) (106 Stat. 1917); jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations.

1864. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the Department's annual report to Congress on the fiscal year 1992 program operations of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs [OWCP], the administration of the Black Lung Benefits Act [BLBA], the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act [LHWCA], and the Federal Employees' Compensation Act for the period October 1, 1991, through September 30, 1992, pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 936(b); jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Post Office and Civilian.

1865. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on the nondisclosure of safeguards information for the quarter ending June 30, 1993, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2167(e); jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Natural Resources.

1866. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of intent to exercise authority under section 506(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, in order to provide emergency assistance to Ecuador, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2318(b)(2); jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

1867. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the Nuclear Reactor Safety Situation in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

1868. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the results of the audit of the principal financial statements of the Defense Cooperation Account, fiscal year 1992, pursuant to Public Law 101-576, section 304(a) (104 Stat. 2853); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Armed Services.

1869. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report entitled "U.S. Navy Compliance with the Marine Plastic Pollution Research and Control Act of 1987," pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 1902 note; jointly, to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1845. A bill to establish the Biological Survey in the Department of the Interior; with an amendment (Rept. 103-193, Pt. 2). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MINETA: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 2223. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 525 Griffin Street in Dallas, TX, as the "A. Maceo Smith Federal Building" (Rept. 103-226). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MINETA: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 2431. A bill to designate the Federal building in Jacksonville, FL, as the "Charles E. Bennett Federal Building" (Rept. 103-227). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MINETA: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 2532. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse in Lubbock, TX, as the "George H. Mahon Federal Building and United States Courthouse" (Rept. 103-228). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MINETA: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 2555. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 100 East Fifth Street in Cincinnati, OH, as the "Potter Stewart United States Courthouse" (Rept. 103-229). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MINETA: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 2559. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 601 East 12th Street in Kansas City, MO, as the "Richard Bolling Federal Building" (Rept. 103-230). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MINETA: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 2677. A bill to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, and construct the West Court of the National Museum of Natural History building (Rept. 103-231, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MINETA: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. S. 779. An act to continue the authorization of appropriations for the East Court of the National Museum of Natural History, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-232, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1348. A bill to establish the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor in the State of Connecticut, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 103-233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MINETA: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 2356. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Army to carry out certain construction projects in the Virgin Islands (Rept. 103-234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MINETA: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 2824. A bill to modify the project for flood control, James River Basin, Richmond, VA (Rept. 103-235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FROST: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 248. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2401) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-236). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALL of Texas:

H.R. 3033. A bill relating to the valuation of stock received by certain employees in connection with the performance of services as employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 3034. A bill to provide Federal penalties for drive-by shootings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3035. A bill to protect the public safety by imposing minimum, mandatory prison sentences for drug crimes involving minors; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

H.R. 3036. A bill to mandate life imprisonment without release for drug traffickers or violent criminals convicted for a third offense; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

H.R. 3037. A bill to provide the penalty of death for certain killings of Federal law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLINGER (for himself, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COX, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HORN, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. MICA, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. KASICH, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. FAWELL,

Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. KLUG, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 3038. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to establish an Office of Inspector General in the Executive Office of the President, and to amend title 31, United States Code, to establish a Chief Financial Officer for the Executive Office of the President; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOAGLAND:

H.R. 3039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on luxury passenger vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 3040. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide civil service retirement credit to a Federal employee for any period of service performed with the American Red Cross abroad during a period of war; to the Committee on Post office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLINK (for himself, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 3041. A bill to eliminate deception in product labeling or marking with regard to the country of origin of merchandise and merchandise parts; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAXON (for himself, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 3042. A bill to prohibit discrimination in contracting with potential contractors and subcontractors in federally funded construction projects on the basis of certain labor relations policies of the potential contractors and subcontractors; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RIDGE:

H.R. 3043. A bill to provide for the voluntary environmental cleanup of existing industrial sites; to further define the cleanup liability of new industries, financial institutions and tenants; to provide for the voluntary cleanup of industrial sites by responsible owners; to define cleanup liabilities on abandoned industrial sites; to establish the Cleanup Loan Fund and the Industrial Land Recycling Fund to aid industrial site cleanups; and to provide for the registration of environmental consulting professionals; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

By Ms. SCHENK (for herself, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. DEAL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. FURSE, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. KLINK, and Mr. MCHALE):

H.R. 3044. A bill to prohibit retroactive income tax increases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 3045. A bill to extend through December 31, 1995, the existing temporary suspension of the duty on diphenyldichlorosilane and phenyltrichlorosilane; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 3046. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to limit the referral by a physician to certain services in which the physician has a financial relationship; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Texas:

H.R. 3047. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of theatrical, ballet, and operatic scenery, properties, and sets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.J. Res. 258. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting retroactive increases in taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

238. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to the Marine Corps Logistics Base at Barstow, CA; to the Committee on Armed Services.

239. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to military base closure; to the Committee on Armed Services.

240. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of the Mariana Islands, relative to Ambassador Franklin Haydn Williams; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. TRAFICANT introduced a bill (H.R. 3048) for the relief of Vivian Eney; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 48: Mr. ISTOOK.
H.R. 58: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 64: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 65: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 66: Mr. DORNAN.
H.R. 68: Mr. CANADY and Mr. FISH.
H.R. 133: Mr. STOKES and Mr. ARMEY.
H.R. 214: Ms. LAMBERT.
H.R. 291: Mr. BAESLER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. GEJDENSON.
H.R. 303: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 431: Mr. MACHTLEY.
H.R. 509: Mr. ISTOOK.
H.R. 546: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BAESLER, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 649: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 773: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 830: Mr. HOEKSTRA and Mr. ARMEY.
H.R. 840: Mr. TUCKER and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 943: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KOPETSKI, Ms. DUNN, and Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 961: Mr. ROEMER.
H.R. 977: Mr. SLATTERY.
H.R. 998: Mr. ROEMER.
H.R. 1027: Mr. TUCKER, Mr. FILNER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. TORRES.
H.R. 1135: Mr. NADLER and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1200: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1276: Mr. GRAMS and Mr. HAYES.
H.R. 1293: Mr. TALENT, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
H.R. 1322: Mr. GALLO and Mr. SOLOMON.
H.R. 1332: Mr. HASTERT and Mr. MCCLOSKEY.
H.R. 1362: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1394: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1423: Mr. LAZIO, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. GILCHREST, Ms.

WOOLSEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. TUCKER.

H.R. 1431: Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 1434: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.

H.R. 1442: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. SANTORUM.

H.R. 1455: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1480: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1583: Mr. MORAN, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 1617: Mr. CRANE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. EWING, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 1618: Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 1671: Mr. WHEAT, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MEEK, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 1709: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 1793: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 1795: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1815: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 1841: Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 1843: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1898: Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.R. 2021: Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 2059: Mr. ARMEY and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 2121: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. BROWDER, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. TALENT, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2132: Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 2173: Mr. GALLO.

H.R. 2207: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 2241: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mrs. MEEK, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. DARDEN, and Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.R. 2292: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 2417: Mr. UPTON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, and Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.R. 2431: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. SHAW, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 2434: Mr. PAXON and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 2443: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MANN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. FROST, Ms. DANNER, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HAYES, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. ROSE, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.R. 2462: Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 2484: Mr. REYNOLDS and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 2529: Mrs. THURMAN and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 2589: Mr. MAZZOLI.

H.R. 2602: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 2609: Mr. HYDE, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. FARR, Mr. PARKER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. LAUGHLIN, and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 2623: Mr. DEUTSCH and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2641: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2691: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 2692: Mr. PASTOR, Mrs. MEEK, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 2710: Mr. STARK and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2727: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2736: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Ms. SCHENK, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 2790: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. SABO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. TUCKER, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 2841: Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.R. 2846: Mr. BRYANT, Ms. MOLINARI, Ms. WATERS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. TORRES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MEEK, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 2848: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 2873: Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. PORTER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. SUNDBLUM.

H.R. 2884: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2933: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2973: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3012: Mr. EVANS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. TALENT, and Mr. SMITH of Iowa.

H.J. Res. 11: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. DANNER, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HAMBURG, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SABO, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HEFFNER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. STARK.

H.J. Res. 79: Mr. BUYER, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. TALENT.

H.J. Res. 86: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. KING, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CARR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. GALLO, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.J. Res. 111: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. DELAY, Mr. COX, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FISH, and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.J. Res. 131: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. GALLO, Mr. MCCREARY, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.J. Res. 140: Mr. COBLE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HILLIARD, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. QUINN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BUNNING, Ms. DUNN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MCCREARY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.J. Res. 145: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. CANADY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. FISH, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.J. Res. 194: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SLATTERY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MANTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. DARDEN, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. EVERETT, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.J. Res. 198: Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DE LA GARZA, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.J. Res. 209: Mr. KIM.
H.J. Res. 212: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. BLILEY.

H.J. Res. 214: Mr. SOLOMON.
H.J. Res. 219: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GOODLING, Ms. DUNN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BONILLA, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ZELIFF, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SANGMEISTER, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 226: Mr. MCDADE.
H.J. Res. 234: Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. MAZZOLI.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. SYNAR.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr.

WOLF, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TORRES, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. FURSE, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. HAMILTON.

H. Con. Res. 141: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HUTTO, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. HUNTER.

H. Res. 86: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.

H. Res. 134: Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HANCOCK, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H. Res. 202: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. FINGERHUT, and Mr. ORTON.

H. Res. 234: Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. BALLENGER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H. Res. 239: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GOSS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

H. Res. 242: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. ARMEY.

H. Res. 243: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. ARMEY.

H. Res. 244: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WELDON, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. ARMEY.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

55. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council of Seattle, relative to the rights of gays and lesbians to fair and equal treatment in the Armed Services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

56. Also, petition of the Municipal Council of Famagusta, Cyprus, relative to the unlawful invasion of the famous harbour and resort town of Famagusta in 1974; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.